Library of the Theological Seminary,

PRINCETON, N. J.

Presented by Mr. Samuel Agnew of Philadelphia, Pa.

Agnew Coll. on Baptism, No.

SCB
10418

A True

NARRATIVE

OF THE

Portsmouth

DISPUTATION,

Between some Ministers of the *Presbyterian*, and others of the *Baptist*, Persuasion, concerning the Subjects and Manner of *Baptism:*

Held in Mr. *Williams*'s Meeting-place there on *Wednesday*, Feb. 22. 169$\frac{8}{9}$.

The MANAGERS

For the *Presbyterians* were,	For the *Baptists* were,
Mr. *Samuel Chandler* of *Fareham.*	Dr. *William Russel* of *London.*
Mr. *Leigh* of *Newport* in the *Isle of Wight.*	Mr. *John Williams* of *East Knoyle* in *Wiltshire.*
Mr. *Robinson* of *Hungerford* in *Berks*, Moderator.	Mr. *John Sharp* of *Froome* in *Somersetshire*, Moderator.

Transcribed from two Copies taken at the *Dispute*; the one by Mr. *Bissel* Town-Clerk of *Portsmouth*, and the other by Mr. *Samuel Ring.*

Revis'd and Publish'd by Dr. *William Russel.*

The Second Edition.

London, Printed for *J. Sprint* at the *Bell* in *Little-Britain.* 1699.

To the most Honourable Governour,

Major-General ERLE;

And the Honourable

Colonel GIBSON,

Deputy-Governour of His Majesty's Garrison of *Portsmouth*,

THIS

NARRATIVE

Is humbly Dedicated,

AS a grateful Acknowledgment of that Favour you did us, in your Application to His August Majesty, to know his Pleasure whether you might admit of a disputation betwixt the Ministers of the *Presbyterian* and those of the *Baptist's* Perswasion, (of which this is the best Account the *Publisher* could obtain;) whereupon his Majesty, out of his wonted Clemency, as an Effect of

that innate Goodneſs which he hath always manifeſted towards his *Diſſenting Proteſtant Subjects*, was graciouſly pleaſed to let us have His Royal Permiſſion, in anſwer to your Requeſt.

For which Favour, together with the Liberty we enjoy in the free Exerciſe of our Religion, we deſire to lay hold on this Occaſion, to expreſs our Thankfulneſs to *God* and the *King*; *praying for His Majeſty's Health and Proſperity in this World, and that God would vouchſafe to enrich him with a Crown of Glory in the World to come.*

Your Honour's,

to my Power,

William Ruſſel.

To

To my much Esteemed and Beloved
Brethren in the Lord,

Mr. *THOMAS BOWES*,

Messenger and Pastor of the Congregation o
Baptized Believers at *Portsmouth*;

AND

Mr. *JOHN WEBBER*,

Pastor of the Church of Christ at *Gosport* unde
the same Profession of Believers Baptism in Water
Together with the Congregations to whom the
belong:

*Wishing your Increase in Grace, and in the Knowledge o
our Lord Jesus Christ; and that God would add to you
number daily such as shall be saved.*

Honoured and Beloved Brethren,

I *Have thought meet to make this* Dedication *also to you, be-
cause ye were not only eye and ear Witnesses of what past in
the* Disputation; *but were privy to all the Circumstance
with which it was attended, and were the sole Cause of my
being engaged in it. How it was managed you best know, an
therefore are proper Judges of the matters of fact related in thi
*Narrative. *For my own part, I have took much pains, and use
great Care and Consideration in the Review of those Papers you
sent me from those that wrote down the Dispute, that I might d
no Wrong to either Party.*

*And herein I have had all the Helps I could obtain both from
our Brother* Williams, *who was engaged with me in the Dispu-
tation; from whom I received (by the hands of Mr.* Sharp, *our*
Mode

Moderator) *an Account of those Arguments he offered, and what else he could remember, taken from his own mouth: besides the account I have had by Letters from divers other Persons that were present. All which I have diligently compared, and have also endeavoured (so far as those Accounts and my own Memory would furnish me therewith) not only to give a true Narrative of what was spoken, but also to give our* Antagonists *Words their due weight as well as our own.*

And if there be any thing omitted therein, they must blame themselves, or their own Scribe, and not us. For Mr. William Leddel *went to Mr.* Smith *their Writer, and carried our Copy with him, and desired him to compare it with his: He answered that his was very imperfect, it being the first time he was in a* Dispute, *and he could not take it, but some things were left out; and said, that it was not as yet wholly written over. Mr.* Leddel *waited upon him a second time, but could not obtain a sight of it to compare them together, although he was satisfied it was then finished. Now whether he did this of himself, or by Advice from them, is best known to himself. However, it leaves us without blame.*

I know it is not proper for me (who was principally concerned in it) to say much concerning the Dispute *it self: for being made Publick, it's left to every one that reads it to judge for himself. Nevertheless, it may not be amiss to make some few Remarks upon it; because it may fall into some hands who may not well understand the Grounds of the Controversie.*

1. *It is agreed on both sides, That Mr.* Chandler's *Sermons were the occasion of that Offence taken by you, and of the* Dispute *it self; as appears by the* Preliminaries *signed by Mr.* Thomas Bowes *and Mr.* William Leddel *on our part, and also by Mr.* Chandler *and Mr.* Williams *on the part of the* Presbyterians: *as you may see in* p. 3, 4.

2. *The Objections being made against what Mr.* Chandler *preached, it had been his proper Work to have vindicated the Truth of his Doctrine against those Objections, by the Authority of Holy Scripture. But instead thereof, he puts us upon it to prove the contrary. But as the learned Dr.* Smith *did well observe,* He that asserts must prove. *And their own* Moderator *did declare, that Mr.* Chandler *had in his Preaching asserted that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, but told us we were not to call on him for that* then.

3. I

3. *I would make this farther Remark upon it, That the Reason why he took this method was, because he was unable to prove what he had asserted: for in one of his Sermons he thus speaks;* But that I may proceed with the greater clearness, I shall do these things; first, prove from Scripture the Warrantableness of Infant-Baptism, *&c. And to make his Assertion good, he cites the Commission,* Matth. 28. 19. *for the Baptizing the Infants of believing Parents. And argues upon it, that Disciples were to be Baptized; and* (*saith he*) we have a plain Text that such infants are Disciples, *see* Acts 15. 10. *And when our Saviour saith,* Go make Disciples, baptizing them, *it must be understood of such Infants. Now as to his Pretence from* Acts 15. 10. *we did sufficiently enervate that. And as for the Commission, Mr.* Leigh *doth confess* (*as well as Mr.* Chandler) *that it is a Command, and that the Command is express'd,* pag. 27. *And further saith, in* pag. 28. We must all confess that Jesus Christ gave Commission to Baptize Believers when at the Age of maturity; but afterwards the Children of those Believers. *Yet when Mr.* Chandler *begins to answer my first Argument, he affirms,* That Christ hath no where expressly commanded Infants to be Baptized. *See* p. 6. *And if so, then Infants cannot be intended, either in that Commission, or any other place where there is a Command in Holy Scripture for Baptism. So that he needs no other Confutation than his own Confession, in the presence, as is supposed, of about* 2000 *Witnesses.*

4. *As for their Consequences which they were so desirous to have a Grant from me that I would allow them to make use of; it's very observable, that if they can do any thing that way it's yet to be done; for they did not offer them to us in the Disputation, but have reserved them in their own Breasts, as the* Pope *doth his unwritten Traditions. And how they should think the People should be convinced of the Truth of their Practice, when they tell them there is no express Command in Scripture for it, and pretend only they have some Consequences to prove it by, and yet refuse to tell what these Consequences are, it is beyond my Imagination. I can assure them, those that can take up a Satisfaction in such empty Pretences, are sufficiently prepared to be Priest-ridden, with a witness.*

5. *When they should have proved* (*if they had known how*) *that Infants are capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, according to Christ's Commission; they tell us* (*instead thereof*)

thereof) *That Children are accounted so when they first enter the School, and call a School-master for their Voucher. When the very naming of it confutes themselves, because they are so far from being made Scholars by Teaching, that they know not one Letter of the Book, by their own Confession.*

6. *I cannot but observe how strenuously they opposed themselve sagainst our way of Baptizing by Dipping; and rejected the Authority of their own Authors, and divers of the greatest Protestant Writers since the* Reformation, *who have asserted our Practice therein to be agreeable to the Etymology of the Word* Βαπτίζω, *and the Practice of* John the Baptist, *Christ and his Apostles; and yet themselves can (when it is to serve a Turn) practise it the same way, by plunging the Person over Head and Ears in Water. An Instance whereof, as I received it (well attested) from several hands (and the Persons own Confession) take as followeth.*

To back that Instance of Mr. Williams's *about the Virgin* Mary *and our Saviour in answer to Mr.* Leigh's *Demand, namely, to give him an Instance of one Person that was born of a Believer, and was Baptized when he came to grown years, see* pag. 34, 35. *we can give you an Account of one whose Parent was a Believer when he was born, and Baptized when adult, by Mr.* Earl *the Presbyterian Minister at* Gosport, *by Dipping, being about* 40 *years of Age. And this was done by the Advice of several of their Ministers, particularly Mr.* Chandler *and Mr.* Williams, *His Name is* Joseph Fox; *he is a near Neighbour of ours. And they did it either by the Commission, or, without regard to it, I know not which; that they best know.*

And by another hand I have this Account.

We have also thought fit to acquaint you with the Person, and his Name, who was Baptized by the Presbyterians at Gosport *which is as followeth*: It was Mr. *Joseph Fox*, living in *Gosport*; who being (by our Brother *Duke*) desired to answer him one thing, which was, Whether, when he was Baptized by Mr. *Earl*, it was done by Dipping the whole Body under Water? And he said, it was; and that in the Presence of four Presbyterian Ministers. *This was acknowledged by him to our Brother* Duke *on the* 20*th of* March 1698-9. *And we do desire you (if you think fit) to place it in some part of the* Dispute, *that the World may be acquainted with that Proceeding of theirs.*

Now

Now by this Action of theirs, if they believe it to be according to the Commission, then they justify our Practice; if they do it for any by-end, without believing it to be according to God's Word, then (as Mr. Calvin *saith) the whole action is but a Sport.*

Now, that Mr. Chandler *can have no other Thoughts of it, doth evidently appear from his own Words: for in his Sermon preached at* Portsmouth *Nov.* 10. 1698. *he saith,* It is not likely that that God that will have mercy and not sacrifice, would institute an Ordinance so prejudicial to the Bodies of Men: and that it's very unlikely that *Dipping*, which whenever it is mentioned, is used as a Token of God's *Vengeance*, should in this Sacrament be used as a Token of his Mercy. Where you read of *Dipping*, you find it mentioned in a way of Wrath and Vengeance. Thus the old World was Dip'd and Drowned for their Sins: God's Vengeance followed them, and they sunk as Lead in the mighty Waters. Thus the *Egyptians* were Dip'd and Drowned in the *Red Sea*. Thus the Lord Jesus Christ shall come down from Heaven, to render Vengeance on his Adversaries; cloathed with Garments Dip'd in blood, *Rev.* 19. 13. [*Here Mr.* Chandler *hath rendered that word* Dip'd *to inveigh and ridicule our Practice of* Dipping, *although he could object against it when I gave it for an Instance*] *But he goes on, saying,* You find still *Dipping* represents in Scripture God's Vengeance and Displeasure. And so I say it is very unlikely, that what was always used as a Token of his Displeasure, should in the New Testament be used as a Token of Mercy. So that it is not necessary that *Dipping* be used in Baptism.

To which I give this for Answer.

1. *If it be so as he saith, then it was altogether unnecessary that Mr.* Erle (*by his Consent*) *should dip Mr.* Fox's *whole Body under the Water.*

2. *That it was not done in Mercy to him, thus to Baptize him; but in Vengeance, and as a Token of God's Displeasure.*

3. *That the Baptism practised by* John the Dipper, *and that of Christ and his Apostles, was not an Ordinance instituted of God in a way of Mercy, but appointed for the People in a way of Wrath and Vengeance: for I have given him a cloud of Witnesses, that they did administer it by Dipping the whole Body under the Water.*

4. *By this he doth condemn and ridicule all those learned Protestants I have mentioned; with many others that might be named.*

And the Divines of the Church of England (*as well as we*) *who appoint* Dipping *as the best way of Baptizing* (*and* Sprinkling *only in case of Weakness*) *and was used by them formerly as their frequent Practice; and is asserted by some of their greatest Divines, to be the old and best way of Baptizing: and is to this day the constant Practice of the Greek Church.*

I am also well assured from some other hands, that, upon the 25th *of* Febr. *last, a few days after the* Dispute, *Mr.* Leigh *said in the Presence of divers Persons, That to satisfy a Scrupulous Conscience he would administer Baptism by* Dipping. *Whereupon Mr.* Williams *askt him if he would do it to answer a Scrupulous Conscience without God's Word? And he answered No. And I have reason to conclude that Mr.* Leigh *may believe that* Dipping *is the right way of Baptizing, whatever he might say in the time of the* Dispute; *because he did say to divers persons, That if it had been in a private Conference, where there had been but a few Persons of a side, he should have made several Concessions, which he was not willing to make in so great an Assembly. And therefore I will not charge those extravagant Expressions of Mr.* Chandler's *upon him*; i. e. *That* Dipping *was always used as a Token of Displeasure. And surely Mr.* Chandler *had mightily forgot himself when he said so: for* Naaman *the* Syrian *was commanded to Dip himself, not in a way of Vengeance and Wrath, but in a way of Mercy: and he found it to be so; for he was perfectly cured of his Leprosie thereby. I would advise Mr.* Chandler *to read over* Rom. 2. 1, 2, 3. *and consider how sharply the Apostle reproves such that condemn others, and yet do the same things themselves; and saith,* Thou art inexcusable, O Man, whosoever thou art, that judgest; for wherein thou judgest, another, thou condemnest thy self for thou that judgest, doest the same things.

How can he, or any of them, condemn our Practice, when themselves can do it to satisfie a Scrupulous Conscience, *or,* &c. *And especially Mr.* Leigh, *who confesses it to be according to the Word of God? And Mr.* Erle *hath done it by their Consent.*

I shall now give you an Account from another hand written from Gosport, *in which (after he hath signified his respects to me,* &c.) *he thus saith*; Although they look on your Arguments to be of little weight, yet we think them to be of too great weight for them to answer with all their Cunning. I hope those that were unprejudic'd will receive some Light, though they endeavoured (as much as in them lay) to dar-

ken

ken Counsel with their mutinos Carriage. But Truth will be Truth still in spight of all its Oppolites; and will shine, though they would cloud it. *This was written after that vain boasting Advertisement of the* Presbyterians *in the* Post man, *which was very pleasing to their Party at* London, *and made so great a Noise all over the Nation, as if they had gotten some great Victory; although in truth it was nothing so: as will evidently appear by this Narrative. But my Friend proceeds, saying,* I hope this Account I have herewith sent you, will come safe to your hands; wherein you may see some of their Curiosity, whereby they say they have confounded your Sophistry. Four things I observed in their Proceedings, which (to me) condemned their Cause.

I. The want of so much as one bare Instance in Scripture to confirm their Practice of Infant Baptism.

II. When they required an Instance of a Believers Child Baptized when adult; and promised when produced they would give us the Cause: which Instance was given, and yet they persisted in it as before.

III. Their appealing to the People to give their Assent that they were satisfied with Mr. *Leigh*'s Argument from *Matth.* 19. 14. *Of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, by holding up their hands: and it was observed there were but few that did hold up their hands in comparison of so great a Multitude; supposed by some not to be one in fifty; and by others, a much fewer number: so that they were far from having the Opinion of the People on their side by way of Approbation, whatever they may say of themselves; which was not a little Mortification to them.

IV. When they could not obtain it by Right, they would have it be theirs by might. And this was evidenced by their repeated Clamours; which was not (when duly considered) to their Honour.

Besides, There have been two Concessions made since the Dispute by themselves, which were these:

1. That there was Credit gained to our cause by this Dispute.

2. That there was Truth and Christianity in it.

For my part, I am satisfied in what was said, and so are our Friends, *&c.*

Sir, This is but some; and considering the Procedure was so clamorous, it may be said to be some of the Spoils won

in Battle, where Innocence and Rancour encountred.

I should be glad to hear of your Welfare, and desire an Interest in your Prayers as oft as you go to the Throne of Grace. *Yours* &c. *Gosport, March* 11. 1698-9.

I will give you an Abstract of another Letter, from a worthy Person in those Parts, directed to me, who was an eye and ear Witness of what past. In which (after Christian Salutations) he saith,

I hope these Lines will find you in Health, after your tedious and uncomfortable Journey, which I hope may bring some Glory to God, notwithstanding the great Rage that the, *&c.* was in. Indeed they had no other shift to save their Reputation, but by casting out a Flood, acting the part of the Serpents hiss amongst the worst. I do understand, several were convinced by their Rudeness; and they are *since* Baptized.

I think it may be convenient to take away the Cloud from the Common People by exposing what was delivered in the Dispute (to publick view) and by adding that which they would not then hear; I mean that which relates to the manner of Administration. You may consider of it. 'Tis pity they should glory in their shame, deceiving the World.

Dear Friend, I thank you for all your Labour of Love. Your Preaching and Behaviour was to me very acceptable, and to all our Friends, *&c.* *Gosport, March* 6. 1698-9.

By these Testimonies you may see, that the Presbyterians *had no Cause to publish what they did to the World, except it were to keep up their declining Reputation.*

After the Dispute *was ended, and I was returned to my Lodging, Mr.* Williams *told me he would go to his Namesake's house to take with the* Presbyterian *Ministers that were there. I desired him to remember my Love to them, and let them know, that I could dispute with Men and yet love them notwithstanding: but desired him to tell Mr.* Robinson, *their* Moderator, *that I took it very unkindly at his hands, that he should transgress so much as he had done against the Rules of Dispute, and be so abusive as he was, so as to give the Lye (for he said in the midst of the* Dispute, *with a loud Voice,* That is a Lye, *and yet could not make any thing out about it;) and for his Misrepresentation of what I had said, particularly upon that Argument about the Beasts of the Field not being capable,* &c.

And

And when Mr. Williams *came to see me before I left* Portsmouth, *he told me that he had delivered my Message to them and that Mr.* Williams *the* Presbyterian *Minister did acknowledge that Mr.* Robinson *had exceeded his Bounds: and that he did abuse me in his misrepresenting of me to the People upon that Argument.*

I answer'd, It was well he had acknowledg'd it now; but it had been better if he had done it before the People.

Mr. Williams *the* Baptist *Minister was pleased to communicate this Account to me by Mr.* Sharp *our* Moderator.

Feb. 23. 1698-9. *Mr.* Leigh *and himself being together at Mr.* Williams's *House in* Portsmouth, *there came in Mr.* Erle, *Mr.* Bowler, *and Mr.* Farrel, *three* Presbyterian *Ministers; and there was two other* Baptists *present at the same time. Mr.* Farrel, *in the Presence of the forementioned Ministers, saluted Mr.* John Williams, *the Disputant, after this manner.*

Mr. Williams, *I must tell you, and that not as my own Sentiments only, but as the Sentiments of every one of our Brethren, that what Credit was gained to your Cause, was gained by you.*

Mr. Leigh *asked Mr.* Williams, *whether we did infer from those words, That the Ministers had granted out of their own mouths that we had gained the Cause?*

His Reply was, No, all that we infer from it was this; That it was an implicit Concession, that there was Credit gained to our Cause.

Mr. Leigh *said, How much Credit did we infer was granted by them to our Cause?*

Mr. Williams *said, We do not know the quantity of it.*

Mr. Leigh *replied, Truly it was but a little Credit that was granted out of our own mouths that was gained to your Cause.*

To which Mr. Williams *answered, That if there was a little Credit granted out of their own mouths, then there was Credit gain'd to our Cause, granted by themselves; which was no farther denied by Mr.* Leigh.

But what was spoken by Mr. John Williams *in the* Dispute, *was abundantly shorter than what Dr.* Russel *did then speak. Thus far as to Mr.* Williams's *Account.*

Notwithstanding all this, whilst they were making these Concessions at Portsmouth, *they let fly an* Advertisement *after Dr.* Russel *to* London, *which was Printed and Published before he got home: for, as Mr.* Williams *said, they knew who had hurt them. Here follows a true Copy thereof.*

The

in

The Post-Man, *Feb.* 25. 1698-9.

Portsmouth, Feb. 23. Yesterday the Dispute between the *Presbyterians* and *Anabaptists*, was held in the *Presbyterian* Meeting-house. It began at Ten of the Cock in the Morning, and continued till Six in the Afternoon, without any Intermission.

The Theme of the Dispute was the Subjects of Baptism, and the Manner how Baptism is to be performed. *Russel* and *Williams* were the Opponents for the *Anabaptists*, and Mr. *Chandler* and Mr. *Leigh* Defendants for the *Presbyterians*. Mr. *Sharp* Moderator for the former, and Mr. *Robinson* for the latter.

Mr. *Russel* opposed *Infant-Baptism*, with all the Subtilty and Sophistry of the Schools; and was answered with good Reason and Learning. Upon the whole, it was the Opinion of all the Judicious Auditory, the *Presbyterians* sufficiently defended their Doctrine, and also worsted their Adversaries, when they came to assume the place of Opponents.

We being silent, and not using the same Methods as they did, to squirt out foolish Advertisements in common News-Papers, *these Men grew confident; and upon the 1st of* April *following, in the* Flying-Post, *they publish a long Story, full of Untruths, and silly squint-ey'd Reflections, not becoming their Learning or Profession: and all to support a sinking Interest. But it appeared so manifestly partial, that there seemed to be little or no credit given to it, except by some few of their own Party.*

For although they were so civil to give themselves the Title of Master, *they grudged to speak so honourably of their* Opponents. *And in the second Paper they say, one Mr.* William *(by some called* Dr.*)* Russel *of* London, *&c.*

All that I shall say to it is this; As I am a Minister of Christ and of the Churches, I can (through the Grace of God) bear all the Indignity and Contempt they can put upon me; if I, by so doing, can but do good to Souls, and bring the least Tribute of Honour to my Lord and Master thereby. I thank God that he enabled me to count the Cost before I was ordained to the Work of the Ministry; and therefore, if Reproaches, yea Bonds and Afflictions, abide me, it is no more than I looked for.

But what Reason these Men have to refuse to give me the civil Title of Doctor, *I know not, neither do I care. But this I know, that many years since, I was not only admitted as* Master of Arts, *but took my Degree of* Batchelor in Physick, *and*

was

was after that Created a Doctor in Physick *of the famous University of* Cambridge, *and also admitted by universal Consent to be a Member of the Senate there: and that not as some have suggested, as if it had been only* ex gratia. *Yet these Men even whilst I was in* Portsmouth *(as well as since) have reported among the People there, that I was* Russel *the Mountebank; a Man that hath been dead several years. They thought (perhaps) by such Artifices to lessen the Peoples Opinion of me. But by making me little, they make themselves the less, in that such Giants (as they would have the People believe them to be) should not be able to conquer such a Pigmy as they have represented me in the Eyes of the Vulgar.*

They have also reported, That I am a Hackney Disputant, *and that I refused to come down to* Portsmouth *under thirty* Guinea's; *but that at last I was prevail'd upon to take Twenty. I did not trouble my self whilst I was at* Portsmouth *to confute them in it, because our Friends there knew how to do it themselves; for they knew the Report to be altogether groundless and false. But seeing I have this opportunity, I think fit hereby to tell the World, That I did not so much as demand one farthing of them for my Journey, neither before nor after. For all that are throughly acquainted with me know, that I do neither Preach for Hire, nor Divine for Money, as some of them do: but as I have freely received, so I desire freely to give; believing that ought to be left to the free Benevolence of the People.*

But that I may do Right to our Friends at Portsmouth *and* Gosport, *I do acknowledge that of their own free good Will (without asking) they did pay my Coach-hire and bear my Charges; which, as they thought it was the least they could do, so I can truly say, it was the most I ever expected.*

I shall close this Epistle, with giving the World an Account of the Occasion of this Publication.

There were two things that moved our Friends thereto.

1. *Their Noise and Clamour they made in the Time of the Dispute; which hindred the People from hearing what was said, especially when they were pinch'd upon an Argument.*

For which Reason, it was thought convenient to publish it, that what they could not be permitted quietly to Hear, they may have the benefit to Read without Interruption; and so have leisure to consider it.

But 2dly, *The principal Cause thereof, was those Advertisements they sent all over the Nation, to misrepresent the Dis-*

pute

ute, *and blind the eyes of the Unthinking about it.* *Whereas this Publication will set the matter in a true Light,* nd let all Men see that they had neither Scripture, nor any ood Consequences deduced from thence, to prove their Practice, ither with respect to the Subjects or Manner. *And therefore* when the People shall see that they have neither Command nor Example for their Practice, *I hope it will be a means to convince* hem of the Unlawfulness thereof; *and that they will not dare* for time to come to practise a humane Tradition in the room of an Ordinance of Jesus Christ: *remembring what our Lord* said of the Jews of old, In vain they do worship me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of men, *Matth.* 15. 9. *And in Mark* 7. 8. For laying aside the Commandment of God, ye hold the Tradition of men. *And then hear what* Paul *saith, Colos.* 2. 20, 21, 22. Wherefore if ye be dead with Christ from the Rudiments of the World; why, as though living in the World, are ye subject to Ordinances (*Touch not, taste not, handle not, which all are to perish with the using*) after the Commandments and Doctrines of men?

Now the God of Peace, that brought again from the Dead our Lord Jesus, that great Shepherd of the Sheep, through the blood of the everlasting Covenant, make you perfect in every good work to do his Will, working in you that which is well pleasing in his sight, through Jesus Christ, to whom be glory for ever and ever. Amen. So prays,

Your Brother and Fellow-Labourer

in the Work of the Gospel,

William Russel.

PROPERTY OF PRINCETON THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY

The Occasion of this Disputation: *And how Dr.* Russel *came to be ingaged therein; According to the Account received from* Gosport *and* Portsmouth. *The Occasion was this:*

THE Congregation of Baptized Believers at *Gosport*, were so blessed with success in their *Ministry*, that in a short time they had gathered Twenty *Members*, very worthy Persons, who were added to them by Baptism. Many others were amazed and put upon Enquiry. This startled the Presbyterian Party, because divers of them were of their Number, either Members or Benefactors; and they began to fear the Issue thereof.

Whereupon Mr. *Sam. Chandler*, of *Fareham*, about five or six miles from *Portsmouth*, a Presbyterian Minister, whom they much esteemed for his Learning, was procured to come and Preach up the contrary Doctrine, first at *Gosport*, and afterwards at *Portsmouth*, upon *Thursdays*, on purpose (as was supposed) to put a stop to this so hopeful a beginning amongst the Baptists, and hinder their Progress therein. And this was managed by him and his Admirers in such a manner, as was to the Grief of such as truely fear God in those Parts. For it was given out, that *Mr. Chandler* would not only prove Infant Baptism from Scripture-Testimony, and Answer all the Objections of the Baptists against it; but also sufficiently furnish his Hearers with Arguments to defend their Practice.

And in the Prosecution of this his Design, he took occasion to make his Excursions, wherein he spake very diminutively of those in the *Ministry*; representing them as Persons Ignorant of, and Unacquainted with the Holy Scriptures. He also Ridiculed and misrepresented the manner of their Performance of this Holy Ordinance, as it represents a Burial and a Resurrection, wherein upon *Rom. 6.* 3, 4. he makes too bold with the manner of our Lord's Burial, and the Apostles Application thereof to Holy Baptism. He might have been pleased to

have wounded the poor Baptists through the Sides of some other Person, than so great an Apostle.

He also did greatly extol the Practice of Infant-Baptism, and the Use and Advantage of it to them, beyond those of riper Years; and did inveigh against their manner of Practice, with most severe Reflections. Upon this, the Presbyterian Party began to triumph over the Baptists, and boasted, that what *Mr. Chandler* had said upon that Point, was unanswerable.

Whereupon, when this last Sermon was to be Preached, wherein he was to shew his great Skill in Answering our Objections: *Mr. Bowes*, and divers other Brethren of both the Baptized Congregations, went and heard him. When he had done, *Mr. Bowes* desired leave to speak, and in a modest and Christian-like manner, did enter his Objection against what *Mr. Chandler* had spoken: and upon a meeting betwixt themselves, they did mutually Agree, That the Points in Difference should be publickly Disputed at *Mr. Williams* his *Meeting-house* in *Portsmouth*; and that *Mr. Chandler* and *Dr. Russel* should be the Disputants.

As touching *Dr. Russel*, his being ingaged in it, it did not arise from any desire in himself to be concerned in it; but from the pressing Importunity of his Friends.

The *Church* at *Gosport* being newly constituted, and being more particularly concerned (as the thing was circumstanced) and supposing that all this Stir and Noise was chiefly designed against them, did first make their Application to him for his Assistance. And in the Name of the *Church*, a Letter was sent to him by one of their worthy Brethren, wherein they express themselves after this manner.

To our Esteemed Brother *Russel*, we of the *Church* of *Christ* at *Gosport*, send Greeting,

WE being under a pressure of Conscience, having of late had the great Ordinance of our Lord Jesus Christ, (viz. that of Believers Baptism in Water) inveighed against, and ridiculed by one of the Presbyterian *Ministers* (*Mr.* Chandler *by Name*;) *and being much grieved that the Ordinance of Christ should be thus triumphed over, and trodden under Foot: and hoping you have so far ingaged your self in Christ's Cause, and that God hath given you Abilities to defend it, we don't only Beg, but Require your Personal Presence, and desire your Assistance to defend that Sacred* Ordinance, &c.

He

He also received several other Letters, Signed by the Ministers, and other Private Brethren, to press him to it.

He did send them word, that it was his Opinion, it would be the best way for *Mr. Chandler* and himself to exchange some Letters betwixt them in the first place, to try the strength and length of their Weapons; and thereby prevent a Publick Disputation, if possible. But when they let him understand that the Matter was too far proceeded in, and so circumstanced, that nothing less than a Publick Dispute could decide it, he then consented to answer their Request therein, because (as they had signified to him) the Glory of God, the Honour of his Truth, and the Good of Souls, was eminently concerned in such a Publick Defence, especially considering that the Presbyterian Party had given out, that we were afraid to meet them: But I shall detain you no longer from the Dispute it self; an Account of which follows.

For the Presbyterians.	For the Baptists.
Mr. Samuel Chandler, of *Fareham.*	*Dr. William Russel*, of *London.*
Mr. Leigh, of *Newport* in the *Isle of Wight.*	*Mr. John Williams*, of *East-Knoyl* in *Wiltshire.*
Mr. Robinson, of *Hungerford*, Moderator.	*Mr. John Sharpe*, of *Froome*, in *Somersetshire*, Moderator.

An Account of the Disputation held at Portsmouth, February *the* 22d. 169⅞.

THE Disputants going to the Place of Meeting, between the Hours of Nine and Ten in the Morning, having took their Places, *Dr. Russel* spake to this Effect.

Gentlemen, Forasmuch as the Work we are going to engage in, is a Part of Religious Exercise; It is my Opinion, we ought in the first place (as is usual upon such Occasions) to be seeking God by Prayer; that his Presence may be with us, and his Blessing upon our Endeavours.

The Motion being accepted, *Mr. Chandler* began the Meeting with a short Prayer, which being ended, the Questions and Preliminaries agreed upon, were read, which are as followeth;

whereas by Mr. Chander's *late Preaching on the Ordinance of Baptism, several Persons have taken offence; and upon desire of Satisfaction, it's mutually Agreed between us, whose Names are*

under-written ; That these Two Points be Amicably Disputed in the following Order, with Relation to Manner, Time, and Place ; as hereafter expres's'd, viz.

Que. 1. Whether according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ, Adult Believers are only the proper Subjects of Baptism : and not Infants ?

Que. 2. Whether the Ordinance of Baptism as appointed by Christ, is to be Aministred by Dipping, Plunging (or) Overwhelming only, and not otherways ?

Agreed, The Disputation be held at Portsmouth *in Mr.* William's *Meeting-Place, on* Friday *the* 10*th. of* February *next ensuing (if God permit) beginning at Nine in the Morning. And if in case the Providence of God should so Order, That either Party should fall sick, or any other unavoidable Circumstance happen ; that then the Time shall be deferr'd to another Day, to be agreed on by the Parties concern'd, not exceeding a Fortnight after ; provided a Weeks Notice be given thereof before the* 10*th. of* February. *Also Agreed, The Parties Disputants be Mr.* Samuel Chandler *of* Fareham, *and* D William Russel *of* London ; *or any other Persons in either of their Steads, supposing them* Ordained *Ministers ; and each Disputant to choose a Moderator.*

The Disputation to be Managed Regularly, with strict Regard to the two above recited Subjects . And if the Moderators shall see fit, during any interval of the Disputants for Refreshment, that two other Persons go on with the Dispute, until they reassume it.

Portsmouth, December, 23*d.* 1698.

Samuel Chandler.
Francis Williams.

Here follows *Mr. Chandler*'s Apology to the People.

My Friends, It is not out of Vanity or Pride, I appear in this Place upon this Occasion at this Time : Most of you know, and I suppose many of you have heard, that in the Course of my Lecture in this Place, I have Discoursed of the great Principles of Religion ; and having explained the *Creed*, and the *Lord's Prayer*, I came to give an Account of the Two Sacraments of the *New Testament* ; and therein was unavoidably concerned to speak to those Truths that are contradicted by these Gentlemen here present.

Those that heard me, know, that I was very Modest in expressing my self in this Controversie : But a bold and confident Challenge was given me, which I knew not how to refuse ; unless I would betray the Truths I believe in my Conscience, or confess my self not able to vindicate them. And accordingly these Men have sent for some Assistance to oppose us in this Matter.

I

I desire these things may be handled with a great deal of Calmness; that we may discourse of things as becomes Christians. And as we have the Favour of the Government both Civil and Military, so we may give them no occasion to repent of allowing us this Liberty.

And also I desire that nothing may be done unbecoming this Place, where we usually meet together for the more immediate Worship of God. And I would have you join with me in this Petition; *That God would grant his Truth may take place.*

He then repeated the Questions to be Disputed, and said, These are the Two Articles we are to Dispute of at this Time. We Deny, and they Affirm.

Then Dr. *Russel* said, Gentlemen, you know I was not present at the drawing up of the Preliminaries, and therefore I think it may be necessary, before we enter upon the Disputation, to know wherein we agree about the first Question, and wherein we differ; that we may not Discourse about those Things wherein we are Agreed.

I do suppose, by the stating of the Question, That you do own that Adult Believers are the proper Subjects of Baptism. And if you do, I would desire you to declare your selves herein.

Mr. *Chandler* said, He did own that Adult Believers were the proper Subjects of Baptism, but not the only proper: Infants were to be baptized also.

D. *Russel.* Then you own our Practice to be right.

Mr. *Chandler.* Yes, if they have not been Baptized in their Infancy; then they are to be Baptized upon Profession of their Faith, when they come to Years.

Dr. *Russel.* You suppose they are to be Baptized by Virtue of some Commission; and that it is by the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mr. *Chandler.* Yes, I do so.

Dr. *Russel* I suppose you expect I should be Opponent first.

Mr. *Chandler.* Yes, that was Agreed.

Dr. *Russel.* If therefore I prove that Infants are not the proper Subjects of Baptism, you will allow that I perform what I have undertaken, we having no other Subjects in the Question but Adult Believers, and Infants.

Mr. *Chandler.* Yes, we do allow it.

Dr. *Russel.* Then I will undertake to prove, that Infants are so far from being the proper Subjects of Baptism, that they are not the Subjects of it at all.

And

And now I would know how we shall Dispute; whether by Reading the Commission, and making an Inference therefrom, and proving that (if we are not agreed about it) from some other Text; or what way we shall proceed in.

Mr. *Chandler*. You must do it Syllogistically; and therefore form your Argument.

Dr. *Russel*. My Argument is this.

Arg. 1. If Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to Baptize Infants, then the Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

But Christ hath no where required any of his Ministers to Baptize Infants;

Ergo, The Baptism of Infants is not according to the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ.

Mr. Chandler. I distinguish here upon your Antecedent. If you mean that Christ hath not expressly commanded Infants to be Baptized; then I deny the Consequence of your *Major*. For Christ hath no where expressly commanded Infants to be Baptized.

Dr. *Russel*. If you will insist upon that, I can easily prove it. For some Persons are expressly commanded to be Baptized in the Commission: Infants (by your own Confession) are not expressly commanded to be Baptized either in the Commission, or elsewhere: But I have neither the Word Commanded, nor expressly Commanded in my Argument; and you must Answer to my Argument.

For I agree with you, that Infants are no where expressly commanded to be Baptized.

Mr. Chandler. There is no need of that; but those of your Way will not allow us to prove it by consequence.

Dr. Russel. I say, that it's no where required: If you prove it any way required, it shall suffice.

Mr. Chandler. If you will allow good Consequences drawn from Scripture, I will deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Russel. Then you must suppose that Christ hath required some of his Ministers to Baptize Infants.

Mr. Leigh. We distinguish between consequential Truths, and expres Words.

Dr. Russel. So do we: But I hope our Lord's Commission about Holy Baptism, is delivered in expres Words, and not consequential. The Term in my Argument is very lax, I do not there say Commanded, but Required; and if you prove the Baptism of Infants any where required by Christ, it is sufficient.

Mr.

Mr. Chandler. Will you allow genuine Consequences drawn from Scripture?

Mr. Leigh. Will you allow good Scripture Consequences in this Case, or do you expect plain Scripture Words?

Dr. Russel. What need is there of so many Words about this? Certainly *Mr. Chandler* is bound to fix upon some Answer to my Argument. I say again, the Term I use admits of any proof; he is not thereby obliged to produce any express Command, if he can do it without; if he prove that Christ hath any way required it, it will suffice.

Mr. Leigh Gentlemen, you that are Notaries, pray observe how ambiguously he expresses himself.

Dr. Russel. I think I express my self plainly enough, when I tell you, That if you prove it any ways required, I will allow it.

Mr. Robinson, their Moderator, saith, Will you allow this of Consequence, or not?

Dr. Russel. Let us not thus stumble at the Threshold, how often must I tell you, that if you can prove it any way required by Christ; prove it either by consequence, or which way you will, if you do but prove it, I will allow it. But you must remember that you are to prove it according to Christ's commission, (for those are the Terms in the Question) and I believe you will find a difficult Task to do that by consequence.

For suppose an Embassador should declare to the Prince to whom he is sent, That his Master hath given him Authority, by his commission, to negotiate with him about such a particular matter that he shall name, and that he is charged to do this in his Master's Name and Stead. If when his *Credentials* are produced there is no such thing mentioned therein, he cannot expect the Prince should give credit to him therein, when he had told him before, it was a part of his Master's commission (which is our case:) And his alledging only consequential Proofs after that, will not serve his turn. But if you think you can do it by consequences, you may try your Skill, with all my heart, so you do but prove it required according to Christ's commission; which is the thing in Question between us.

Mr. Chandler. What, from the commission?

Mr. Robinson the Moderator cries out to *Mr. Chandler*, Hold! *Dr. Russel* must prove it by an universal Negative.

Dr. Russel. Then *Mr. Chandler* must deny some part of my Argument, which I have not yet been able to prevail with him to do.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the *Minor*.

Dr. Russel

Dr Ruſſel. By denying the *Minor*, you ſay that Chriſt hath ſome where required ſome of his Miniſters to baptize Infants.

Mr. Chandler. By good conſequence.

Dr. Ruſſel. Then I will make good my *Minor* thus: If Chriſt hath any where required any of his Miniſters to baptize Infants§, it's ſomewhere ſo recorded in the Holy Scriptures.

But it's no where ſo recorded in the Holy Scriptures:

Ergo, Chriſt hath not any where required any of his Miniſters to baptize Infants.

Mr. Chandler. What do you mean by being recorded?

Dr. Ruſſel. I hope you know what the word Recorded ſignifies. I mean any where ſo written.

Mr. Chandler. To this I anſwer by diſtinguiſhing again. If you mean by being Recorded in Scripture, being Recorded in expreſs words, I deny your *Major*; but if you mean by conſequence, I deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. If you do but prove it Recorded, it is ſufficient.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. Then you ſay it's ſomewhere ſo Recorded in Holy Scripture. I therefore argue thus.

If it be any where ſo Recorded in Holy Scripture, *Mr. Chandler*, or ſome other Perſon is able to ſhew it.

But neither *Mr. Chandler*, nor any other Perſon whatſoever, is able to ſhew it:

Ergo, It is not any where ſo Recorded in Holy Scripture.

Mr. Chandler. I deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. Hold Sir, it is an univerſal Negative. You muſt give your Inſtance where it is ſo written. I appeal to your Moderator.

Mr. Robinſon. You muſt prove it ſtill. Suppoſe *Mr. Chandler* cannot give an Inſtance, nor no body in the Company; you cannot thence infer that none in the World can.

Dr. Ruſſel. This is in Effect to give away your Cauſe, when there are ſo many Men of Parts and Learning preſent; if none of them are able to give us one Inſtance from Scripture for Infant-baptiſm, we cannot expect that any body elſe ſhould.

Beſides, I would deſire thoſe Honourable Perſons and others in this Aſſembly that underſtand theſe things, to conſider that I am not fairly dealt with, and that I am under a great Diſadvantage, not having other learned Perſons to aſſiſt me as *Mr. Chandler* hath, and yet am forced to anſwer two or three at a time. But to proceed, I do affirm that it being an Univerſal Negative, he ought to give his Inſtance, and I demand it of him; and till he doth, my Argument ſtands good.

Mr. Chand-

Mr. Chandler. This is only a Trick to turn off the Oppo- nency.

Dr. Ruſſel. What do you talk of a Trick? I hope you are able to give one ſingle Inſtance of what is your daily Practice.

Mr. Leigh. You do this to turn the Opponency upon *Mr. Chandler.*

Dr. Ruſſel. If *Mr. Chandler* will ſay he can give no Inſtance, I will urge it no further.

Here Mr. Chandler *was going to ſpeak, and Mr.* Leigh *hindred him.*

Dr. Ruſſel. Sir, why do you hinder *Mr. Chandler* from ſpeaking?

Mr. Chandler. Becauſe you would turn the Opponency upon me.

Dr. Ruſſel. I intend no ſuch thing. When you have brought your Inſtance, after I have ſpoken to it, I will then go on with the Opponency.

Mr. Leigh. You can bring no Argument can throw the Opponency upon him like this.

Mr. Robinſon. You muſt know that according to all the Rules of Logick you are to prove your Propoſition. For you univerſally affirm it, though in Form it runs negatively. You ſay no Perſon can give an Inſtance in Scripture whereby we baptize Infants: How do you prove this?

Dr. Ruſſel. I never yet knew that an univerſal Negative was an Univerſal Affirmative. This is to ſay any thing, tho' never ſo contrary to Truth I wonder at it that you ſhould take the matter upon you thus by Turns; eſpecially that you ſhould take upon you to be a Diſputant, whoſe Work is only to be a Moderator. Is this civil Treatment to a Stranger that comes ſo many miles to meet you?

Mr. Robinſon. I muſt not ſuffer the Queſtion to be alter'd. *Mr. Chandler* is Reſpondent; you put the part of an Opponent upon him, I muſt not allow it: Do you prove your Queſtion.

Dr. Ruſſel. Mr. Chandler (I underſtand) hath ſignified to the People in his Preaching, that there are plain Scriptures to be brought for the proof of Infant-Baptiſm, and now is the time for him to produce them: I urge it upon him to aſſign but one Inſtance, and you will not ſuffer him ſo to do.

Mr. Leigh. 'Tis not *Mr. Chandler's* Sermon, it is the Queſtion before us that you muſt regulate.

Dr. Ruſſel. If you ſay you have no Scripture proof for Infants Baptiſm, I have done. But why muſt you prevent *Mr. Chandler?*

I hope here are some Honourable Persons and others that understand the Nature of this Controversie, and they may reasonably expect that those who have made such a Noise about it, can give some tolerable Instance for it; and if they will do that, we will proceed to examine it.

Mr. Robinson. There are many here know how that *Mr. Chandler* hath asserted and proved that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism; but you are not to call on him for that now. You did (by your Friends) undertake to prove the contrary, and it rests upon you so to do.

Dr Russel. I have already prov'd the contrary, and my Argument will stand good till you give your Instance.

Mr. Robinson If you will change Sides, *Mr Chandler,* you may admit this Trick.

Dr. Russel. Can you (at other times) boast of so many plain Scriptures for your Practice, and now you are brought to the Test about it, you are not able to produce one; what will the People think of you?

Mr. Leigh. I will undertake in any Dispute Philosophical or Divine, in this manner immediately to turn the Opponency upon the Respondent. When I cannot prove the Assertion, I will presently say, If you can bring any solid Proof for your Practice, it is true, if not, false. And I appeal to the Moderator, whether it be not his Business to keep the Disputants to the Rules of Dispute.

Mr. Robinson. The Moderator is to regulate them if they transgress Bounds; but you have grossly transgressed: I appeal to any that understand Logick, whether this be sufferable for him thus to turn the Opponency upon *Mr. Chandler.*

Then Dr. Smith *stood up and said,* If I must speak, then by your Leave, according to what I always understood, He that asserts must prove.

Dr Russel Then they having asserted that Infants are the Subjects of Baptism, they are to prove their Practice, especially when they are forc'd upon it by an Universal Negative. We desire but one single Instance, and they will not assign it.

Mr. Robinson. No; you are to prove your Argument.

Dr. Russel. I have done that already, and therefore if Mr. *Chandler* will confess he hath no Instance to give, I will proceed to a new Argument.

This Mr. Chandler *refused to do, and yet would not give his Instance.*

Dr. Russel. If *Mr. Chandler* can give no Instance, here are divers other Ministers, Gentlemen of Parts and Learning: Have none

none of them an Instance to produce? If you thus refuse to produce it, the People will think you have none to give.

Notwithstanding this, none of them could be prevailed upon to do it, although they were called upon, and challenged to give any one Instance (where it was so written) if they could.

Whereupon *Dr Russel* spake to this Effect, Gentlemen, It may be you think I have but one Argument; if you will say no more to this, I am not willing to tire out the Auditory, I will therefore proceed to a New Argument.

But take notice (by the way) that my first Argument stands good, till you give your Instance to the contrary.

Arg. 2. If Infants are not capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men, then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

But Infants are not capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men.

Ergo, They cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

Mr. Chandler repeats the Argument, and then saith, Here if you mean by being made Disciples, actual and compleat Disciples, I deny your *Major*: But if you mean such as are entered into a School and given up to Instruction, then I deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Russel Repeats his *Major*, and desires *Mr. Chandler* to tell him what he denies in it. For (saith he) my Words are plain, to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Robinson. *Mr. Chandler* distinguishes between Compleat and Incompleat Disciples.

Dr. Russel. But what then doth he mean by denying my *Major*?

Mr. Robinson. He denies, that they that cannot be made compleat Disciples, are not intended in the Commission.

I hope the Reader will observe how often *Mr Chandler* was at a loss, and *Mr. Leigh* and *Mr. Robinson* were forced to help him out with their Distinctions and equivocable Expressions.

Here *Dr. Russel* (seeing they would not be brought to give any direct Answer) turns his Hypothetical into a Categorical Syllogism.

Whosoever are uncapable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men, they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission:

But Infants are uncapable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men:

Ergo, They cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in Christ's Commission.

Now let *Mr. Chandler* tell me what he means by being made Compleat, or Incompleat Disciples by the Ministery of Men (according to my Argument) if he can.

Mr. Chandler. I mean by Compleat Disciples, such as are actually capable of Learning: By Incompleat, such as are entered in such Places in order to be taught. We send Children to School before they know a Letter.

Dr Russel. My Argument speaks not of such; but of those who have understanding, and are capable to be made Actual Disciples, which Infants are not.

Mr. Chandler. That such as are so capable, are the only Subjects of Baptism; you are to prove it.

Dr. Russel. Then you deny the *Major*.

Mr. Chandler. Yes, as to your Hypothetical Argument.

Dr. Russel. If you had done this before, you had saved your self and me much trouble. Then I prove it thus.

If our Lord in that Commission given for Holy Baptism, hath commanded his Apostles, that were Men, to make Disciples by their Ministry, and after that, to Baptize them, then the Consequence of the *Major* is true.

But our Lord in that Commission given for Holy Baptism hath commanded his Apostles, that were Men, to make Disciples by their Ministry, and after that to Baptize them.

Ergo, The Consequence of the *Major* is true.

Mr. Leigh I distinguish thus. They may be entered into the Church in Order for Learning, and so they are Disciples before Baptism: Yet in a more visible Sense, they are made Disciples by Baptism

Dr. Russel. Then you suppose Infants not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Chandler. Not solemnly invested.

Dr. Russel. We are not talking of that; the Question betwixt us is, Whether they are capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. Will you assert that?

Mr. Leigh. We assert they are Disciples, as Children of Believers, before Baptism.

Dr. Russel. This is nothing to the Purpose, but to spin out Time. *Mr. Chandler* or *Mr. Leigh* should have answered to my Argument, which neither of them have done. For if Infants are Disciples simply as being Children of Believeing Parents, before Baptism, (as *Mr Leigh* saith) then it is done without any Ministerial Instruction. And therefore is so far from being an Answer to my Argument, that it is a meer Evasion.

I therefore Argue thus upon them.

If Infants are not the Subjects of Teaching, according to Christ's Commission, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism by that Commission.

But

But Infants are not the Subjects of Teaching, according to Christ's Commission.

Ergo, They are not the Subjects of Baptism by that Commission.

For what our Lord hath joined together, no Man ought to separate.

But our Lord hath joined Teaching and Baptizing together.

Therefore no man ought to separate.

And it is further manifest, That our Lord did not command his Father to make Disciples by some secret Work of his; but he commanded his Apostles (that were Men) to make Disciples by their Ministry; and that is the Point you are to Answer to.

Mr. Robinson. He denies they are uncapable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men

Dr. Russel. Then by the way take notice, that he grants my *Major* to be true; that unless they are capable to be taught by the Ministry of Men, they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism. I shall therefore proceed to the proof of my *Minor.*

If Infants have no knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

But Infants have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil.

Ergo, They are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Chandler. You Trick all this while. I told you by Infants being Disciples, I meant their being solemnly Invested by Baptism.

Dr. Russel. You still mistake, we are not speaking of their Investiture, but of the Prerequisites of Baptism: And it is evident from what I have said, that those that are truly Baptized according to Christ's Commission (which is the thing we are upon) must first be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. For the Commission in *Mark* 16. 15, 16. is a Command to his Apostles to go into all the World, and Preach the Gospel to every Creature, and that such of them that were made Disciples by their Preaching, they should Baptize. And in *Matth.* 28. 19. They are commanded to Disciple all Nations, and to Baptize such of them whom they had made Disciples by Teaching.

Now when I have shewed you, how that Infants not being capable thus to be made Disciples, they cannot be the Subjects of Baptism intended in that Commission; then you grant the Consequence of the *Major*; and by denying my *Minor*, you say they are capable.

And

And when I have brought another Argument to prove my *Minor*, you then evade it by an indirect Answer.

Sir, you are bound to give a direct Answer to my Argument.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the Consequence of your *Major*.

Dr. Russel. By so doing, you say, though they have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, yet they are capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. How can this possibly be true?

Mr. Leigh. You will not allow of Compleat and Incompleat Disciples.

Dr. Russel. What is this to my Argument? Pray let Mr. *Chandler* fix on something.

Mr. Chandler. I say if you mean Incompleat Disciples, I deny that they are uncapable to be such.

Dr. Russel. How often must we have this distinction repeated to keep us from the Point in hand. We are now upon this, Whether Infants have Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil; which is the *medium* I bring to prove the other by: Why do you not answer to that?

Mr. Chandler. They have no Knowledge, yet are capable of being Incompleat Disciples.

Dr. Russel. If by Compleat, you mean perfectly so, I know not of any such Christian in the World. But I hope this doth not hinder, but there may be Real and Actual Disciples of Christ, made so by the Ministry of Men, and fitted for Holy Baptism. But I proceed to the proof of my *Minor*.

If the Gospel in the Ministration of it, was appointed to inform Men what is Good, and what is Evil, and Infants have no Knowledge to discern betwixt Good and Evil (as Mr. *Chandler* hath been forced to confess) then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men:

But the Gospel in the Ministration of it was appointed to inform Men what is Good, and what is Evil, and Infants have no Knowledge to discern betwixt Good and Evil, as Mr. *Chandler* hath been forc'd to confess:

Therefore they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of men.

Mr. Robinson. When Mr. *Chandler* hath distinguished, you must put it into a Syllogism, else you will still confound it.

Dr. Russel Answers, Have I not put it into an Argument and you will not suffer him to answer it? If you think he hath not sufficiently done that already, let him do it again, and tell us what he means by it, if he can.

Mr. Chandler. I mean one designed and given to Learning, solemnly engaged to it, dedicated to the Work, as a Child entered

entred into a School before he understands one Letter; this is Incompleat; Compleat is to be made so by Learning.

Here *Dr. Russel* would have spoke, but was not permitted, but broke in upon.

Mr. Leigh. I appeal to any, whether a Child sent to School to a Master or Mistress; given up by the Parents, and accepted by them; whether the Notion of a Scholar be not grounded on such a Relation?

Dr. Russel. I speak of Actual Disciples, made so by Teaching; are these such, who (by your own Confession) know not one Letter of the Book? These are Incompleat Scholars indeed, *Mr. Leigh.* I believe there is a School-master here; let him speak whether such be not immediately Scholars.

Upon this, *Mr. Ridge* the School-master stood up and said, Upon the Parents Dedication, and the Masters Acceptation, and the Payment of Entrance money, we do look upon him as a Scholar. Whereupon there followed a general Laughter.

Dr. Russel. I appeal to this Assembly, whether my Argument did not express such that were made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. What therefore is the Reason of your making such a noise and stir about such being accounted Scholars so soon as they enter the School, before they know one Letter of the Book. Are these made Scholars by Teaching, when they have never learned, nor cannot learn; because they have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil: And yet this is the case of those little Infants you pretend to baptize.

Mr. Chandler. We allow they are not capable of Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil, nor of being made compleat Disciples.

Dr. Russel. Then the Consequence necessarily follows, that Infants are not at all intended in the Commission of our Saviour, *Matth.* 28. 19.

Mr. Robinson. Put it into a Syllogism.

Dr. Russel. There is no need of that, for Mr. *Chandler* hath granted every part of my Argument.

For 1. He hath granted that Infants have no Knowledge to discern between Good and Evil.

2. That (according to my Argument) Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men. And then it must unavoidably follow, they are not intended in Christ's Commission.

Mr. Leigh. How Sirs! Did we say Incompleat Disciples are not in the Commission?

Dr. Russel. That hath been sufficiently spoke to already; I shall therefore proceed to a new Argument.

Arg.

Arg. 3. If the Apostle *Paul* did declare all the Counsel of God, and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel Institution according to Christ's commission; then it is no Gospel Institution, nor any part of the Counsel of God, nor profitable for the Church of God.

But the Apostle *Paul* did declare all the Counsel of God and kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God, and yet did never declare the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel Institution according to Christ's commission.

Ergo, It is no Gospel Institution, nor any part of the Counsel of God, nor profitable for the Church of God.

Mr. Chandler. Your Argument is long.

Dr. Russel. Not so long, nor so hard to be understood.

Mr. Robinson. Such long Arguments are never admitted in any Disputation.

Dr. Russel. Let *Mr. Chandler* speak to the Argument.

Upon this, *Mr. Chandler* finding himself unable to answer it, notwithstanding he had two or three Prompters to instruct him, he quitted the Place of a Disputant, and *Mr. Leigh* desir'd to take it up, which was admitted him, upon condition he would speak to that Argument, which he promised to do.

Mr. Leigh. I deny that the Apostle *Paul* did never declare Infant-baptism to be a Gospel Institution.

Dr. Russel. Then you deny my *Minor*, which I thus prove.

If the Apostle *Paul* hath so declared it, it is somewhere to be found in the Writings of the New Testament.

But it is not any where to be found in those Writings.

Ergo, The Apostle *Paul* did never so declare it.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the sequel of your *Major*; for the Words were spoken to the Church at *Ephesus*; and what do you talk of *Paul's* Epistles, he wrote but one that I know of to the Church at *Ephesus*.

Dr. Russel. Part of the words in my Argument were spoken to the Elders of the Church of *Ephesus*; but I have neither *Ephesus*, nor Church of *Ephesus*, nor *Paul's* Epistles in my Argument. Why do you not answer to the Argument.

Mr. Leigh. We have not the whole of the Apostle *Paul's* Writings in the New Testament; and this that he wrote to the Church of *Ephesus* is but a small part thereof.

Dr. Russel. Pray speak to the Argument: You see I have no such Expressions in it as are taken up by you.

Mr. Leigh. I will do it by a Simile.

You know that *Paul* wrote divers Epistles, and in them of different Subjects.

It

It is as if a Man should write a Book of several things, and when he hath finished it, one comes and cuts off six Leaves thereof; and after this, there is a Question arises, whether such a Man hath writ any thing about such a particular Subject. Now it doth not follow, that because it is not contain'd in the rest of his Book, that therefore it is not in the six Leaves that were cut off.

Dr. Russel. If *Mr. Leigh* speaks *ad Rem*, as I suppose he thinks he doth, then I thus infer upon him. First, That he doth by this allow, that there is no mention made of Infant Baptism in any of those Writings of the Apostle *Paul*'s, that we have bound up with the rest of the Holy Scriptures. Secondly, He supposes there may be something said of it in those six Leaves that were cut off after he had finished his Epistles.

Now the Assembly of Divines tell us, that the Scriptures of the Old and New Testament are the only Rule to direct us in matters of Worship. But whether *Mr. Leigh* be of their Mind I cannot tell.

Mr. Leigh. Yes, I am.

Dr. Russel. Then what you mean by it I know not, but I believe they meant what we have in the Bible, and not what is contained in those six Leaves that were cut off, or else they designed to put a Cheat upon the whole World, which I do not suppose.

But as touching those six Leaves, I conclude our Brethern have them not in their Custody, because I never heard them speak any thing in the least concerning it.

For my own part, I can speak for my self; I never saw them, nor heard of them till now; neither do I know any thing of the matter. But if *Mr. Leigh* or his Brethren have them in their Custody, I desire they would produce them. And when they have so done, if they will please to favour us so far as first to prove that those were the very six Leaves that were written by *Paul*, we will take the pains to examine them: And if it then appears that there is any such thing contained in them as *Mr. Leigh* speaks of, we will allow it.

Mr. Leigh *was angry hereupon, saying*, What do you talk of our being the Keepers of them? And what do you talk of all the New Testament? Is all the New Testament the Apostle *Paul*'s writings?

Dr. Russel. I say I do not confine you to *Paul*'s Epistles, much less pretend all the New Testament to be of the Apostle *Paul*'s Writing, as you would insinuate to the People; but my Words are, It's no where so declared in the Writings of the New Testament. And do you produce one Instance that it is, if you can, for that will put an Issue to our Controversie.

Mr. Leigh. You would refer what *Paul* saith to the Church of *Ephesus*, to the whole New Testament.

Dr. Russel. I hope you will own the Holy Scriptures to be the only Rule to direct us in matters of Worship.

Here Mr. Leigh *breaks in upon the Doctor, not permitting him to speak what he had to say; but instead thereof, he saith,* I will not own that we have all the Sermons that *Paul* Preached to the Church at *Ephesus*, and if we had, he might Preach it to some others though he did not to them, for this was spoken to them.

Dr. Russel. I refer you to the Scripture. You say that *Paul* might declare some such thing, and yet it may not be Recorded in the Scripture. The Words are plain, *I have not shunned to declare to you all the Counsel of God.* Acts 20. 27. And in Ver. 20. *I kept back nothing that was profitable unto you.* And I do not suppose that *Paul* taught one Doctrine in one Church and another Doctrine in another. For in 1 *Cor.* 4. 17. He tells that Church, *Timothy shall bring you into remembrance of my ways in Christ as I teach every where in every Church.*

Besides, he doth not only tell them that he had so discharg'd his Office among them as to be free from the Guilt of their Blood, but that he was also free from the Blood of all Men, Ver. 21. Testifying to the *Jews* and also to the *Greeks*, Repentance toward God, and Faith toward our Lord Jesus Christ.

And I further add, That if *Paul* never taught Infant-Baptism in the Church of *Ephesus*, nor in the Church of *Corinth*, nor in any other Place, I hope you will then acknowledge it to be no Gospel Institution, nor any part of the Counsel of God, nor yet profitable for the Church of God: And there is no Record in Holy Scripture of his so doing.

Mr. Leigh. I say *Paul*'s Writings are not the hundredth Part of what *Paul* Preached. We cannot suppose that in those six Chapters to the *Ephesians*, he could contrive to put down the whole of his Preaching to them.

Dr. Russel. Sir, you might have spared all this Labour; for I am satisfied the People will not trouble themselves to seek for it any where else, but only in the Writings of the New Testament; and if they will take my Word, I can assure them 'tis not there to be found. And I perceive you think so too, or else you need not refer them to *Paul*'s Sermons which are not written. *I have heard, indeed, of some unwritten Traditions, that are lock'd up in the Pope's Breast, to be delivered out as he finds Occasion for the serving of a Turn; but I never knew that the Presbyterians were ever intrusted with any such Treasure.*

Mr. Leigh You say it is not to be found in the Writings of the New Testament; I deny it.

Dr. Russel.

Dr. Ruffel. Then you deny my *Minor*, which is the thing you should have done before, only you were afraid of being brought to give an Instance. Now by denying my *minor*, you say it's somewhere so recorded in the Writings of the New Testament, that *Paul* did declare the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel-Institution, *&c.* And. to prove it is not, I argue thus.

If it be so recorded in the Writings of the New Testament, then Mr. *Leigh* or some body else is able to shew it.

But neither Mr. *Leigh*, nor any body else, is able to shew it.

Ergo, It is not so recorded in the Writings of the New Testament.

Sir, I have now brought it to an Universal Negative, as I did with Mr. *Chandler* upon the former Argument; and now it rests upon you to produce your Instance.

Mr. *Leigh.* I will say it is in the Commission. All Nations.

Dr. Ruffel. Are you of Mr. *Chandler*'s Opinion?

Mr. *Leigh.* I will not answer you.

Dr. Ruffel. Then I say it is not written in the Commission that *Paul* did ever declare any thing concerning the Baptism of Infants.

But what do you bring this for now? you might have done it upon the first Argument, when we were upon the Commission; but it's wholly improper now; for this that we are now upon, is, Whether the Apostle *Paul* hath any where so declared it.

Reader, Observe these mens Trifling. Do they not know as well as we, that the Commission of our Lord for Holy Baptism was given long before *Paul*'s Conversion; and yet they have the Confidence to affirm before so great an Auditory, That it is written in the Commission, that *Paul* did declare the Baptism of Infants to be a Gospel-Institution, *&c.* which is the thing expressed in my Argument.

Upon this, the Reverend Mr. *Chandler*, (who had quitted the Work before) began now in a great Fury to break Silence again, saying, You are a perfect Sophister, your Arguments are full of Fallacy.

Dr. Ruffel. It is an easie matter for a man to say so, that understands not an Argument himself.

Mr. Leigh. Then, pray Sir, begin again from *Acts* 20. 27.

Dr. Ruffel. Truly, *Mr. Leigh*, I did not come so many miles to spend my Time thus, to go backwards and forwards after this manner.

Mr. Chandler. You must do so, if you understand the Rules of Tergiversation.

[*This was one of Mr.* Chandler's *Witticisms.*]

Dr. Ruſſel. If I do not underſtand thoſe Rules when I have occaſion for them, I will come to you and learn.

But to return to *Mr. Leigh*, for I have not done with him yet: Sir, you have aſſigned the Commiſſion to prove that *Paul* did declare Infant-Baptiſm to be a Goſpel-Inſtitution, part of the Counſel of God, *&c.* Now it's impoſſible that ſhould be written in the Commiſſion, as I have told you before: You muſt therefore ſhew us where it is ſo Recorded in ſome other part of the *New Teſtament*; and not aſſign a place where there can be no mention of it.

Mr. Leigh. He ſays he gives us the Latitude of the whole *New Teſtament*, but will not admit of the Commiſſion, becauſe that doth not ſay that *Paul* hath ſo declared.

Dr. Ruſſel. And there is very good reaſon for it, for the Apoſtle *Paul* is now under conſideration, as mention'd in my Argument; who ſolemnly proteſteth, that in the diſcharge of his Miniſtry, he had freed himſelf from the blood of all men, in delivering to them all that his Maſter had given him in Commiſſion. That he had not ſhunned to declare all the Counſel of God, he had kept back nothing that was profitable for the Church of God; but as a faithful Steward of the Myſteries of God, he did diſpence the Word, as himſelf declares in 1 *Cor.* 4. 1, 2. And I verily believe, that *Paul* was as Faithful, as Eminent, and as Laborious a Servant as ever Chriſt had upon Earth. And therefore the force of my Argument depends upon this, That if *Paul* never ſaid one word about Infant-Baptiſm, then it can be no part of the Counſel of God, nor a Goſpel-Inſtitution, nor ever given him in Commiſſion by his Lord and Maſter.

You have denied my *minor*; I have proved it by bringing you to an Inſtance by an Univerſal Negative. You have aſſigned the Commiſſion; I have ſhewed you the Impoſſibility of proving it from thence. I have preſſed you to aſſign ſome other part of the *New Teſtament* for an Inſtance. I have not as yet been able to obtain it. Here are divers men of Parts and Learning among you, can none of you produce ſo much as one Inſtance to prove it? Surely the People muſt needs conclude you have none to give. I therefore challenge you to produce the place where it is written, that *Paul* ever ſaid one word of Infant-Baptiſm. And till that be done, my Argument will ſtand good.

Mr. Leigh. If *Paul* did not declare it, if we have other places apparent and plain, at leaſt conſequential, it is ſufficient.

Dr. Ruſſel. This is not an Anſwer to my Argument, you might have gone here upon the other, but cannot upon this; why did you not aſſign ſome of thoſe places then. *Mr.*

Mr. Chandler. We deny the Conſequence, *Paul* might ſpeak of it ſome where elſe, though it is not found in his *Epiſtles.*

Mr. Robinſon. You are to prove that, becauſe *Paul* did not ſhun to declare to the Church of *Epheſus* the whole Counſel of God, therefore Baptizing of Infants muſt be found there, or elſe it is no part of the Counſel of God.

Mr. Leigh. However, we will ſuppoſe the thing (but not grant it) that *Paul* has not ſpoken of Infant-Baptiſm.

Mr. Williams. If you ſuppoſe it, we will take it for granted; if we may not, ſay ſo.

Thus ended their Oppoſition to this Argument.

Dr. Ruſſel. I will now proceed to another Argument.

Arg. 4. Chriſt's Commiſſion doth ſhew who are to be Baptized:

But it doth not ſhew that Infants are to be Baptized:

Ergo, Infants are not the Subjects of Baptiſm according to Chriſt's Commiſſion.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the *Minor.*

Dr. Ruſſel. By ſo doing, you ſuppoſe it doth ſhew it.

I therefore thus Argue.

If the Commiſſion doth ſhew that Infants are to be Baptized, *Mr. Leigh*, or ſome other Perſon can ſhew it us in the Commiſſion.

But neither *Mr. Leigh*, nor any other Perſon is able to ſhew it us in the Commiſſion.

Ergo, The Commiſſion doth not ſhew that Infants are to be Baptized.

Mr. Leigh. It is included in the Word, All Nations.

Dr. Ruſſel. I beg your favour; *Mr. Chandler* aſſerted in his Sermon, That it was the Infants of Believing Parents that were to be Baptized: And that it was neceſſary Men ſhould Repent and Believe, otherwiſe they had no Right to this Ordinance. And if we were ſent (ſaith he) into an Heathen Nation, we ought to ingage men to Repent and Believe, before we Adminiſter this Ordinance to them. Here are Qualifications required in the Perſons to be Baptized (by your own Confeſſion) without which you muſt not Adminiſter it. And it is contrary both to your own Principles and Practice, to baptize Jews, Turks and Heathens, and all their Infants, without previous Qualifications to fit them for it.

Mr. Leigh. I ſay it is included in the Word, All Nations: Do you prove it is not.

Dr. Ruſſel. You have brought an Inſtance, and it is your buſineſs to make good your own Inſtance; otherwiſe my Argument ſtands firm and untouch'd.

But

But if I shew there are some Qualifications required in the Commission, and prove that those cannot be found in Infants; then Infants cannot be included in the Word, All Nations.

I tell you he hath commanded us to baptize some Persons, but he hath not commanded us to baptize any Infants; which I thus prove.

If those that Christ in his Commission hath commanded to be baptized, must first be made Disciples according to that Commission; then Infants are not to be baptized by Virtue of that Commission.

But those that Christ in his Commission hath commanded to be baptized, must first be made Disciples according to that Commission.

Ergo, Infants are not to be baptized by Virtue of that Commission.

Mr. Leigh. I deny your Consequence. Repeat it again.

Dr. Russel. Then I will make it Categorical.

All those required to be baptized by Christ's Commission, are Disciples: Infants are not capable to be Disciples, as I have already proved.

Ergo, Not required to be baptized by Christ's Commission.

Mr. Leigh. I deny your whole Argument: That all that Christ requires to be baptized, are Disciples, and that Infants are not capable.

Dr. Russel. If no other but Disciples are expres's'd in the Commission, then the *Major* is true.

And if Infants are uncapable to be made Disciples, then the *Minor* is true also.

Mr. Leigh. We say they are implied; you allowed good Consequences but now.

Dr. Russel. But here are Disciples mentioned in the Commission; and none but such that are made so by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Leigh. You talk of the Commission: It is the good Consequences I insist upon; and say, Persons are not to be compleat Disciples before they are baptized; nor actually taught before they are Disciples.

Dr. Russel. Perhaps you mean a man is not a compleat Christian, if he hath not attained to the highest Perfection he is capable of whilst in this Life; although he hath been a real Christian for many Years. I speak not of such a Completion, but of such that are actual Disciples of Christ, made so by the Ministry of Men.

Mr. Leigh. I say there is no necessity of being Disciples in your Sense, before they are baptized.

Dr.

Dr. Ruffel. Then I will prove there is a neceſſity.

If our Lord in his Commiſſion did not require his Apoſtles to baptize any, but only ſuch as they had before made his Diſciples by Teaching; then there is a neceſſity they ſhould be Actual Diſciples before they are baptized.

But our Lord in his Commiſsion did not require his Apoſtles to baptize any, but only ſuch as they had before made his Diſciples by Teaching.

Ergo, There is a neceſsity they ſhould be Actual Diſciples before they are baptized.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the *Minor*.

Dr. Ruſſel. Then I will read the Commiſſion.

Mr. Leigh. You need not do that, we all know the Commiſſion very well.

Dr. Ruſſel. I will read my Maſter's Commiſſion, *Mat.* 28. 19. *Go ye therefore, and diſciple all Nations, Baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghoſt.*

This Commiſſion is very ſolemnly delivered, wherein our Lord declares, that all Power in Heaven and Earth was given to him. And by Virtue of that Power — Here Mr. *Robinſon* ſtops the *Doctor*, and cries out, You are not to preach here, Sir.

Dr. Ruſſel. May I not have leave to draw my Inference from the Text?

Mr. Leigh. Form your Argument. The Text doth not diſcover it.

Dr. Ruſſel. Is not our Lord's Commiſſion of as good Authority as my Argument? When I have ſpoken to that, I will then form an Argument from it, if you will be ſilent, and ſuffer me ſo to do.

I ſay, that in this great Commiſſion, our Lord declares his great Power.

Mr. Leigh. Form your Argument.

Dr. Ruſſel. I hope the uſe of all our Syllogiſms is to bring us to the Commiſſion: And now we are come to it let us ſee whether theſe things are to be found therein, or not. Will you pretend that Infants are in the Commiſſion, and muſt not the People be ſuffered to ſee whether there be any thing mention'd about them, or not.

Mr. Robinſon. Is this your Argument? Bring your Argument. And then he bawls very loud, ſaying, Mr. *Williams*, will you ſuffer him to Preach?

Mr. *Williams* anſwers, No, I will not ſuffer him to Preach here.

Dr. Ruſſel. What do you talk of Preaching? Are ye afraid of the Commiſſion? I hope it is not ſo bad with you as it was with

with some in Times past, whom one of the Fathers (*i. e. Tertullian*) calls by the name of *Lucifugæ Scripturarum, &c.* Flyers from the Light of the Scripture (as Bats do from the light of the Sun:) What is the reason, Gentlemen, you will not endure to hear the Commission opened? Will you fly from the Light of the Commission of our Lord and Saviour Jesus Christ? Is it not the Subject contained in the Question; And will you (or dare you) deny that what I have said is in the Commission?

Mr. Leigh. We say not so.

Dr Russel. If you should, you would directly oppose Mr. *Calvin.* For he saith, *There is no mention made of Infants in the Commission*, as it is express'd either in *Matth.* 28. or *Mark* 16. And further saith, we may as well apply those words in 2 *Thess.* 3. 10. *That if any would not work, neither should he eat:* To little Infants, and so keep them from Food till they starve, as to apply what is said in the Commission to them, whereas it belongs only to the Adult.

Mr. Robinson This is not to the purpose, what have we to do with what Mr. *Calvin* says?

Dr. Russel. I did not know but you might have had a Veneration for *Mr. Calvin*; but seeing it's otherwise, I will thus Argue from the Commission.

If there be an express Command in our Lord's Commission for the baptizing of some Persons, and there be no express Command neither there nor elsewhere, for the baptizing of Infants; then the Baptism of Infants is not contained in that Commission:

Mr. Robinson, We say though ——

Dr. Russel What again *Mr. Robinson?* must I always be thus broke in upon by you? What is the meaning of it? When you see you are like to be pinched upon an Argument, then you make it your business to hinder me from speaking: Doth this become a Moderator?

I beg I may have Liberty to speak out, and not be thus taken up in the midst of an Argument. Pray, Sir, remember what the Wise-man saith of such a one, that answers a matter before he hears it.

I say, if there be an express Command in our Lord's Commission for the baptizing of some Persons, and there be no express Command neither there nor elsewhere for the baptizing of Infants; then the Baptism of Infants is not contained in that Commission:

But there is an express Command in our Lord's Commission for the baptizing of some Persons; and there is no express Command either there or elsewhere for the Baptizing of Infants:

Ergo,

Ergo, The Baptism of Infants is not contained in that Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. Instead of giving his Answer to the Argument, he shams it off after this manner; saying, I appeal to the People. Though he allowed Consequences but now, yet now he requires an express Scripture. And yet I say, If Nations include Infants, they are expressly mentioned.

Upon this, Mr. Robinson *turns Dictator, and says to Mr.* Leigh, You were better deny his Consequence.

Dr. Russel saith, Pray, Mr. *Leigh*, be pleased to change places with Mr. *Robinson*, let him be Disputant, and you Moderator; for I perceive neither you nor I are able to please him. *This was refused. Upon which Dr.* Russel *said to Mr.* Robinson, Pray, Sir, do not you thus Dictate to him, I have none to Dictate to me: Pray let him answer my Argument.

Here Mr. Leigh *did as* Mr. Robinson *had taught him, and denied the Consequence; and also that an express Command was necessary to Authorize the Baptizing of Infants.*

Dr. *Russel*. My Argument was, If there be an express Command for the baptizing of some Persons, you deny the Sequel of the *Major*; and in so doing you say, That notwithstanding there is no express Command for the baptizing of Infants, neither there nor elsewhere in all the Holy Scripture; yet nevertheless they are intended in the Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. I do so.

Dr. *Russel*. And I say, if there be an express Command for the baptizing of some Persons; but none at all for the baptizing of Infants: Then they are not at all intended in that Commission.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny first the sequel of the *Major*, and then I will deny your *Minor*.

Dr. Russel. This seems very strange, that when I have made it appear so evidently from the Commission it self, that there is an express Command for the baptizing of some Persons; and yet it should not be allowed as a necessary Consequence from the Premises, that Infants are not intended; when your selves have confessed there is no express Command in all the Scriptures, for the baptizing of Infants.

Mr. *Leigh*. I deny the sequel.

Dr. Russel. Then I will prove that there is an express Command for the baptizing of some Persons, from the Commission it self.

Mr. *Leigh*. That is not the sequel of the *Major*, it is that I deny.

Dr. Russel. And I bring the Commission to prove it. But you say, that notwithstanding our Lord hath expressly commanded

some Persons to be baptized; although he hath not commanded Infants to be baptized, yet they may be some of that Number Hath Christ two sorts of Subjects that he commands to be baptized in that Commission? Or, rather, are some commanded, and others not commanded, and yet both to be baptized; the one by a Command, and the other without?

Here Mr. Leigh *refuses to Answer, and Cries out*, Put it into a Syllogism.

Dr. *Russel.* If no Persons are to be baptized according to that Commission, but what are there expressly commanded; and Infants are not so commanded; then the Consequence of the *Major* is true:

But no Persons are to be baptized, according to that Commission, but what are there expresly commanded; and Infants are not so commanded:

Ergo, The Consequence of the *Major* is true.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny your *Minor.*

Dr. Russel By so doing you say there are some to be baptized that are not there expresly commanded.

Mr. Leigh Do you not know your own Argument?

Dr. Russel. I repeat it not for my own Knowledge, but for the Peoples Information. And I prove my *Minor* thus:

If the Words of the Commission are an expres Command to the Apostles, to direct them who they should baptize, then the *Minor* is true:

But the Words of the Commission are an expres Command to the Apostles, to direct them who they should baptize:

Ergo, The *Minor* is true.

Mr. *Leigh* I deny your *Minor.*

Dr. Russel. If there be no other Commission of our Lord for Holy Baptism, but what is Recorded in *Matth.* 28. and *Mark* 16. then the *Minor* is true:

But there is no other: *Ergo*, The *Minor* is true.

Mr. *Leigh* I deny the sequel of your *Major.*

Dr Russel. But we are now upon the Commission.

Mr *Leigh.* We are so: But we say, good Consequences derived from the Commission, are sufficient.

Dr. Russel. So you may if you please; but I had rather walk exactly according to the Commission of our Lord, than by such Consequences wherein I may be deceived.

Mr. *Robinson.* I matter not what you had rather do, or what your Opinion is, I am for Consequences.

Mr. *Leigh.* I deny the sequel of the *Major*; That they are to baptize none, but such as they are expresly commanded.

Dr Russel. Then I thus Argue:

If

If there be no manner of Allowance given them to baptize any other but what they are expresly commanded, then the Sequel of the *Major* is true :

But there is no manner of Allowance given them to baptize any other but what they are expresly commanded :

Ergo, the Sequel of the *Major* is true.

Mr. Leigh was pleased here to give a general Denial, without Distinguishing : Upon which *Dr. Russel* referr'd him to his former Argument, wherein he had already shewed, that there is an expres Command for the Baptizing of all such, that they are required to baptize by Virtue of Christ's Commission

Mr. Leigh. I deny your *minor*, but distinguish between the Command being expressed and the Subjects intended.

Dr. Russel. If the Words in the Commission about Holy Baptism be a Command from Christ to his Apostles, then the *minor* is true :

But the Words in the Commission about Holy Baptism are a Command from Christ to his Apostles.

Ergo, The *minor* is true.

Mr. Leigh. Upon Distinction; we deny that all the Subjects are expres'd.

Dr. Russel. My Argument saith, They have not Allowance to baptize any other. I am now therefore to prove that the Commission is a Command to them, if you deny it.

Mr. Leigh. I allow that the Command is expres'd : But I say the Subjects are to be brought in by Consequence.

Dr. Russel. Then I will prove that the Subjects are expres'd.

If Christ did command his Apostles to baptize such as believe and are made Disciples, then the Subjects are expres'd :

But Christ did command his Apostles to baptize such as believe and are made Disciples :

Ergo, The Subjects are expres'd.

Mr. Leigh. I find a fault with your Syllogism ; your *major* should be Universal.

Dr. Russel. I was to prove there is a Command, with Respect to the Subjects; and therefore I have form'd the Syllogism right. For it is evident that Believers and Disciples are the Subjects they are commanded to baptize.

Mr. Robinson You must say *all* the Subjects.

Dr. Russel. By your Favour, there is no need of that. For *Mr. Leigh* denies there is an expres Command in Christ's Commission for any Subjects.

Mr. Leigh. I hope the People can testifie that I said the Command is expres'd : But the Subjects to be brought in consequentially.

Dr. Russel. Is not that the same which I say you said? I know you allowed there was a Command for the thing it self, but not for the Subjects. And therefore I have answered rightly, and your Opposition is unreasonable.

Mr. Leigh. We must all confess that Jesus Christ gave Commission to baptize Believers when at the age of Maturity. Such as were before *Jews* and *Greeks*, and Newly-believing in the Lord Jesus, were thereupon to be baptized; but afterwards the Children of those Believers.

Dr. Russel. It's said in *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved.* Here is not one Word of Infants.

Mr. Leigh. And it follows, *He that believeth not, shall be damn'd.* Now if Believing be previous to Baptism, by the same Way of Arguing it must be necessary to Salvation; and so you must say, That all not believing are damn'd, and so all Infants are damn'd.

Dr Russel. This is a *Non-sequitur*: For Infants are not at all intended in this Commission, as I have already shewed you, and as *Mr John Calvin* doth also affirm.

But I hope *Mr. Leigh.* will allow our Saviour's Words to be True; That all those his Apostles preached to, according to his Commission, if they did not believe, they should be damned. For of such it is said, *He that believeth not, is condemned already, because he hath not believed in the Name of the only begotten Son of God.*

But as touching Infants, I am far from believing that God hath decreed them (as such) to eternal Damnation. I will rather believe that all Infants dying in their Infancy are elected, than conclude that any of them are damned. And I suppose you do not know the contrary. If you do, I desire you would tell the People so.

Mr. Leigh. What do you put that upon us for?

Dr. *Russel.* Because I think it's reasonable you should tell the People what your Opinion is, seeing you have started it; for you see I have given my Opinion freely about it; and if you think otherwise, pray tell the People so.

For then I conceive that your baptizing their Infants will do them no good; for you cannot alter the Decrees of Heaven: Or if you believe, as the Papists do, that Grace is conveyed to them barely by the Act done, notwithstanding the Children are wholly passive in it, pray tell us so.

Mr. Leigh refused to answer to the Former, but gave this Answer to the Latter: No, we deny that.

Here *Mr. John Williams*, baptiz'd Minister, offered his Arguments.

If

If Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission, then Infants are not

But Believers are the only Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission:

Therefore Infants are not.

Mr. Leigh denied the sequel of the *major*; which was thus proved.

If Infants are incapable of believing, then they are not the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission:

But Infants are incapable of believing:

Therefore they are not the Subjects of Baptism according to the Commission.

Mr. Leigh said the Greek Word signified to make Disciples; and I deny that Infants are incapable of being made Disciples.

Mr. *Williams* said he did not understand Greek; he must leave that to his Brother.

Then Mr. *Leigh* said, I deny the *minor*.

Mr *Williams* proved his *minor* thus:

If the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will, then Infants are incapable of believing:

But the Essence of Faith consists in the Act of the Understanding and of the Will:

Therefore Infants are incapable of believing.

Mr. *Leigh* denied the sequel of the *major*, which *Mr Williams* thus proved.

If none can believe on Jesus Christ, that never heard of Jesus Christ, then Infants are incapable of believing:

But none can believe on Jesus Christ, that never heard of Jesus Christ:

Therefore Infants are incapable of believing.

Mr. Leigh denied the sequel of the *major*.

But he should have remembred what is written, *Rom.* 10. 14. *How shall they believe in him of whom they have not heard? and how shall they hear without a Preacher?* And I do not suppose our Antagonists think they are obliged to Preach to Newborn Infants. And yet the Administration of Baptism is (by the Commission) restrained to such as are made believers by the Preaching of the Word.

These Arguments being sufficient to prove the Incapacity of Infants believing, the next Argument *Mr Williams* offer'd, was from thence, to prove that Infants could not be the Subjects of Baptism according to Christ's Commission.

If the Administrator must have an Account of the Faith of the Subject before he baptize him, then Infants are not the Subjects of baptism according to Christ's Commission:

But the Administrator must have an Account of the Faith of the Subject before he baptize him :

Therefore Infants are not the Subjects of baptism according to Christ's Commission.

Mr. Leigh denied the *minor*.

For the Proof of which, *Mr. Williams* urged two Scriptures, *Acts* 8. 36, 37. and *Matth.* 28. 19. and said, when the Eunuch proposed for baptism, *Philip* tells him, *If thou believest with all thy heart, thou mayst.* The contrary (that fairly offers it self) is this; That if thou dost not believe with all thine Heart, thou mayst not. And upon this, the Eunuch declared his Faith before he was baptized.

From whence it's evident, the Eunuch was content to be taught; *Philip* teaches him; and yet after this, he must know whether he believes, before he baptized him. Therefore it follows, they must have actual Learning; and the Minister must also know that they have it before he baptize them.

And in *Matth.* 28. 19. *Go disciple to me all Nations, baptizing them.* From whence I thus argue.

If Ministers have no commission to baptize any but such as are discipled to *Christ*, then they must have an Account of their Discipleship before they baptize them.

But Ministers have no commission to baptize any but such are discipled to *Christ*.

Therefore they must have an Account of their Discipleship before they baptize them.

To which was added, that *Erasmus* in his Paraphrase upon the New Testament, reads the commission thus, *Go and teach all Nations, and when they have learned, dip them.* And I further say, If the Administrator must have an Account of the Person's learning before he be baptized, then a bare going to School is not sufficient to constitute him a Disciple.

Mr. Robinson. Do you see, Sirs! this Gentleman grounds his Opinion upon the Authority of *Erasmus*.

Dr. Russel. Why must *Erasmus* be thus slighted? Here are some Honourable Persons know very well, that *Erasmus* was a man not to be despised for his Skill about the Etymology of a Greek Word. But any thing serves your turn at a Pinch.

Mr *Leigh.* He quotes *Erasmus*; and it's well known he was between Papist and Protestant. Now many of these men, speaking against Infant-baptism, will call it Popery; and yet he quotes *Erasmus* for their Judgment.

Now, forasmuch as *Mr. Leigh* slipp'd the Argument, and only replied to that of *Erasmus*, that he was an *Inter-Papist*, &c. *Mr Williams* gave him this Answer,

Sir

Sir, You have heard my Argument, to which you have given no Answer. As touching *Erasmus*, I did not quote him as building my Faith on his Authority, but for his Judgment; it being the Translation of a man that understood the Original: And although he was not accounted one of the best of men, yet he was accounted one of the best of Scholars in his Time.

Mr. Leigh. And now as to the Eunuch, he was a Proselyte too, and his Infants, if he had any, were to be taken in also. *Philip* comes to him, and he requires a Confession of his Faith, because he was a grown man. Yet had he had an Infant with him, he had had a Right to this Ordinance after he believed. When by your Opinion it must be cast out, because not capable of actual Believing.

Now I deny that he that administers the Ordinance, must always have an account of the Person, whether he hath Learned, or not.

(I suppose Mr. *Leigh* forgot himself, to talk of an Eunuch's having Children. It puts me in mind of a Story I lately heard, of a Presbyterian Minister that undertook (in a Sermon) to prove Infant-baptism, and to that end chose this Text for his purpose, of *Philip's baptizing the Eunuch.* And when he had insisted some time upon it, he speaks after this manner to the People: *Beloved, when you are gone, perhaps you will say, What is all this to the purpose? Here is not one word of Infants in the Text. It is true,* says he, *there is not, but I will tell you how that comes in: Had he had his Wife and Children with him, they had then been baptized as well as himself: But they were at a great distance from him; but as soon as he came home, immediately he baptized them all.* I will make no Comment upon it, but only this; If these Gentlemen know what an Eunuch is, then it's vain Babling; if they do not, let them go to the Grand Signior's *Seraglio,* and learn.)

Mr. Williams. We have plain direction for what I have said; *Philip* said to the Eunuch, *If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest.* And accordingly he took an account of his Faith.

And in the Commission, *Go disciple all Nations, baptizing them.* From whence it's evident, it was those they had made Disciples, that they were to baptize. And therefore they must know whether they are Disciples or no, before they must adventure to baptize them.

Mr. Leigh. You argue thus, because αὐτὲς *Them,* is of the Masculine Gender, it must agree with μαθητὰς *Disciples,* being of the same Gender, and not with πάντα τὰ ἔθνη *all Nations.* But any School boy that hath but learned his Greek Grammar, can resolve this.

Now

Now Mr. Williams *had told him before, that he did not understand* Greek; *and so he made bold to vapour with it, when he was responding to him.*

But Mr. Leigh *might have been so civil to have told the Old Gentleman his Sense of it, and not (in such a light manner) to have referr'd him to a School-boy for his Information.*

A School-boy knows (if Mr. *Leigh* doth not) that the Rule in the Greek Grammar is as follows:

Relativum cum Antecedente concordat Genere, Numero, & Personâ. And therefore must give it for Mr. *Williams.*

But I will refer the Reader to a better Authority than a School-boy: The late Reverend and Learned Minister of the Gospel, Mr. *John Gosnold*, in his Book Entituled, Βαπτισμὸν Διδαχῆς, *pag.* 24 who thus saith, *The word* Them *(Baptizing them) hath no reference unto all Nations, as is to be seen in the Grammar of the* Text, αὐτὰς, Them, *being of the Masculine Gender, but* πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, all Nations, *of the Neuter.*

This *Them* then must have reference to Disciples, to such as are first Taught:

But *Mr Williams* passes by this trivial Flourish, and proceeds to a new Argument.

If Infants are incapable of denying themselves for Christ, then they are incapable of being made Disciples of Christ.

But Infants are incapable of denying themselves for Christ: Therefore they are incapable of being made Disciples of Christ.

Mr. Leigh *denies the Sequel of the* major.

Mr Williams *proves it thus.*

If a Person cannot be his Disciple unless he deny both Relative Self and Personal Self, then the Sequel is true:

But Infants are not capable so to do:

Therefore the Sequel is true.

Mr. Leigh. This purely refers to grown Persons; and by the same Argument you may say Infants must not Eat; because it is said in another place, *He that cannot work, must not eat.*

Mr. Williams. Nay, Sir, It is he that *will not work*, not he that cannot. It is he that is able and will not. For I hope you will provide for your Parents, when by reason of Age they are not able to work for themselves.

Mr. Leigh. But this purely refers to grown Persons, and I deny that Believers only are Disciples.

Mr. Williams. I proved that thus: Those that in *Matth* 28. are called Disciples, are in *Mark* 16. called Believers: So that they are the same Persons intended.

Hereupon Mr. Leigh *not being able to give a direct Answer, endeavours to shift off the force of those two Texts, and his Inference from them, by this Evasion.*

Mr.

Mr. Leigh. I would know whether Infants are not as capable of believing in Christ, as of comming to Christ? Now they are said to come when their Parents brought them. For Christ says, *Suffer little Children to come unto me:* And it's most probable they were brought in the Arms to Christ. Why may they not be said to believe, when they do not actually believe; if imputatively they are said to come when their Parents brought them?

So, why may not they be said to believe imputatively, when their Parents devote them to Jesus Christ, although the Children do not actually believe, but only the Parents?

Mr. Williams. I deny the Parents Faith was ever imputed to the Child. Prove it if you can.

Mr. Leigh. We talk of believers *in foro Ecclesiæ* and *in foro Dei* with Distinction. and under this Notion, and no other do we account believers are so.

And under this Notion, I mean in *foro Ecclesiæ*, the Parents Faith may be imputed to their Children.

Mr. Williams. We say a Person is not a Disciple of Christ, till he hath learned *Christ.* We do not allow of any such Imputation: And Mr. *Leigh* hath not offer'd any thing to prove it.

Dr. Russel. It is time to come to some Instance; therefore to force you upon it, I argue thus:

If the Apostles of our Lord did never baptize any Infant, then the baptism of Infants is not according to *Christ*'s Commission:

But the Apostles of our Lord did never baptize any Infant: *Ergo*, The baptism of Infants is not according to *Christ*'s Commission.

Mr. Leigh. I deny your *minor.*

Dr. Russel. I prove my *minor* thus.

If there be any account that the Apostles did ever baptize any Infant, it is somewhere Recorded in the Writings of the *New Testament.*

But it is no where so Recorded in those Writings:

Ergo, There is not any account that the Apostles did ever baptize any Infant.

Mr. Leigh. I deny your *minor.*

Dr. Russel. I must now force you upon an Instance by an Universal Negative.

If there be any such account in those Writings, Mr. *Leigh*, or some other Person is able to shew it us:

But neither Mr. *Leigh* nor any other Person is able to do it:

Ergo, There is no such account there to be found.

Here Mr. Leigh, *being wholly destitute of an Instance; to shift it off, he denies the Sequel of the* major. *And saith,* it doth not follow it must of necessity be written in the *New Testament.*

Now although this was contrary to the Rules of Dispute, yet Dr. Russel *could not urge him to give any Instance; wherefore he Argues upon him thus.*

Dr. Russel. If nothing else will do with you, I will prove the sequel of my *major*, according to your denial.

If there be no other Rule left to direct us how we are to Worship God in this Ordinance of Baptism according to the Gospel, but what is contained in the Writings of the *New Testament*; then it must of necessity follow, that it be therein written, if such an account be any where to be found:

But there is no other Rule left to direct us how we are to Worship God in this Ordinance of Baptism according to the Gospel, but what is contained in the Writings of the *New Testament.*

Ergo, It must of necessity follow, that it be therein written, if such an account be any where to be found.

Mr. *Leigh.* I say it might be practised in those Times, though not Recorded in the *New Testament.*

Dr. Russel. Will you grant that it is not Recorded in the *New Testament.*

Mr. *Leigh.* We will suppose it; but not grant it.

Dr. *Russel.* The reason why you suppose it, is because you cannot prove it: For you are not so free of your concessions.

Mr. *Leigh.* It is not Recorded in the *New Testament* what you practise, that grown Children of Believers were baptized. I challenge you to give one Instance of any one born of believing Parents, baptized at Age.

Dr. Russel I have called for one Instance from Scripture several times, of any one Infant that was ever baptized, and you have not been able to produce it. This you now speak of, is besides the matter we are upon: And is used on purpose to divert us from our Argument, and lead us to something else that is foreign to it. Pray do you first shew us where it is so written in the *New Testament*, that any one Infant was baptized, if you can: and then you shall hear what we have to say.

Mr. *Leigh.* These Men talk much of Scripture, and call upon us to produce Scripture for our baptizing of Infants; as if they had abundance of proof for their Practice: Now let them give but one Instance of what is their Practice; namely, of one Person that was born of a Believer, and was baptized when he came to grown Years; and I will give them the Cause.

Dr. Russel.

Dr. Ruſſel. I will Inſtance in *Conſtantine the Great*, whoſe Mother *Helena* was a Chriſtian, and yet he was not baptized till he was conſiderably in Years.

Beſides, I do not remember, that there is any account in Hiſtory, during the firſt 500 Years, that any one of the Fathers, or eminent Biſhops of the Church, that were born of Chriſtian Parents, were baptized until they were about Twenty or Thirty Years of Age. And if any of you know the contrary, I deſire you would ſhew it.

Mr. Leigh. What do you tell us of the Fathers? We are not bound to abide by their Teſtimony.

Dr. Ruſſel. This is the firſt time I have ever met with this Anſwer from you Pædobaptiſts, to tell us you diſown the Teſtimony of the Fathers in the point of Infant Baptiſm. When you think the Fathers are on your ſide, then we can hear enough of them; but now you ſee they are againſt you, you will not abide by their Teſtimony. You know I do not alledge it to prove the Inſtitution, but only Matter of Fact. But ſeeing you will not abide by their Teſtimony, I ſhall leave it to be conſidered by the People; For I am well ſatisfied there are ſome Honourable Perſons here, know what I ſay to be true.

Mr. Williams *doth then proceed to a Scripture Inſtance; and asks Mr.* Leigh *this Queſtion.* Was not the Mother of our Lord a Believer, when Chriſt was born?

Mr. Leigh anſwers, What do you ask that Queſtion for? Every Body knows that.

Mr. Williams. But do you believe it?

Mr. Leigh. Yes, I do believe it: What then?

Mr. *Williams.* Then here is an Inſtance for you from Scripture, of the Child of a Believer, that was a Believer before he was born; and yet he was not baptized till he came to Years. And this we can prove.

Upon this the People fell a laughing at Mr. Leigh, *and his Countenance changed pale; and he was under ſome ſeeming Conſternation of Mind, ſo that he could not preſently recover himſelf; but at laſt his Spirits rallied again, and then he ſpake to this Effect.*

Mr *Leigh* Our Diſcourſe was grounded on the Commiſſion. Now was this before the Commiſſion, or after it?

Dr. Ruſſel. It is a miſtake Mr. *Leigh*, we were not now upon the Commiſſion, but upon your Queſtion. And I think Mr. *Williams* hath given you a pertinent Anſwer, every way ſuitable to your Queſtion, and the Challenge you made us: and you are bound to take it. *Upon this he made no Reply: but addreſſed himſelf to us after this manner.* Now if you pleaſe will become Opponent. *Our Anſwer was,* You may, if you think fit, we are contented.

Mr. Leigh. Then I Argue thus.

If Infants are visible Church-Members, then they are to be baptized.

But Infants are visible Church-Members.

Ergo, They are to be baptized.

Dr Russel This Argument doth not include the Point in Question, for you ought to put in these Words, according to Christ's Commission.

Mr. *Leigh* refused so to do.

Upon which Dr. Russel *asked him this Question.*

Are you of Mr. *Chandler*'s mind in this Matter? *He says* That Baptism is an Initiating Ordinance.

Mr. *Leigh* answered, Yes, I am.

Dr. Russel. Then make Sense of your Argument, if you can: For it will run thus.

If Infants are already visible Members of the Church, then they are to be baptized that they may be made so.

It is as if I should say, That because such a Man is in this House already, therefore there must some Act pass upon him to bring him in, when he is actually in the House before. Make Sense of this, if you can.

However, I will deny the *Minor*; and say they are not visible Church-Members before they are baptized.

Mr. Chandler. If there be no Precept or Example in all the Word of God, to warrant us to make any other Initiating Ordinance into the Church but Baptism, then visible Church-Members ought to be baptized.

But there is no other Initiating Ordinance into the Church besides Baptism:

Ergo, Visible Church-Members ought to be baptized.

Dr. Russel. What, doth not *Mr. Chandler* know the difference between the *Major* and *Minor*? I deny the *Minor*, and his Argument is to prove the Sequel of the *Major*: which I had confuted before.

But if this be true that *Mr. Chandler* says, it is a full Answer to *Mr. Leigh*'s *Minor*: For then it runs thus: if there be no other way to bring Persons into the visible Church but by Baptism; then they were not visible Church-Members before they were baptized. Which is directly opposite to what *Mr. Leigh* hath affirmed.

Mr. Robinson. This Argument was brought to prove that visible Church-Members are to be admitted to Baptism.

Mr. Williams. I deny that Infants are visible Church Members in their Infancy.

Mr. Leigh.

Mr. Leigh. I will prove that some are so, from *Mat.* 19. 14. *Suffer the little Children, and forbid them not, to come unto me for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

Dr Russel. Do you bring this to prove that these Children were Baptized?

Mr. Leigh. No, I do not pretend to any such thing.

Dr. Russel. What then do you bring it for?

Mr. Leigh. I bring it to prove that Infants are visible Church-members

Dr. Russel. If you had brought it to prove that Infants had a right to the Kingdom of Glory, I should have thought you had brought it to a better purpose, and more agreeable to the scope of the Place.

Mr. Leigh. I argue thus upon it.

Those that belong to the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the visible Church of Christ, are visible Church members:

But the Kingdom of Heaven, that is, the visible Church of Christ, is in part made up of little Children:

Ergo, Little Children are visible Church members.

Dr. Russel. I might here object against the form of your Argument: But to pass that by, I do deny your *minor*.

Mr. Leigh. I shall prove my *minor*, by an Induction of Particulars.

There are divers Acceptations of the Kingdom of Heaven in Scripture. As,

1. It signifies the Laws and Promises of the Kingdom.

2. The Graces of the Kingdom, whereby we are enabled to observe those Laws. And thus it is set forth by a grain of Mustard-seed, by Leaven and the like.

3. It sometimes signifies Jesus Christ's Management of his Subjects on Earth.

4. And sometimes it signifies the Happiness of the Saints in Glory.

5. And many times it is taken for the visible Church Militant. And in no other Sense but this last, can it be taken in this Scripture to make good Sense of it; which I shall prove by an Argument of Induction.

If it be Nonsense to say, Of such is the Laws and Promises of the Kingdom; If it be Nonsense to say, Of such is the Graces of the Kingdom; If it be Nonsense to say, Of such is Christ's management of his Subjects on Earth; if it be Nonsense to say, Of such is the Happiness of the Saints in Glory; and it be good Sense to say, Of such is the Visible Church; then the visible Church is in part made up of little Children:

But it is Nonsense to apply it to all the other; and it is good Sense to say, Of such is the visible Church: *Ergo*,

Ergo, The visible Church is in part made up of little Children.

Dr. Russel. There is so much Nonsense in this Argument, I know not well how to make Sense of it: It seems to me little to the purpose. But however, I will deny your *Minor* and say, It is good Sense to say, that little Children belong to the Kingdom of Glory.

I pray observe (by the way) what sort of subjects Mr Leigh's *Church must consist of; if they have no Interest in the Graces of the Kingdom, nor yet in the Glory of the Kingdom.*

Mr. Leigh. I say it's Nonsense to understand it otherwise.

And upon this he desired, that all those who were satisfied with what he had said should hold up their hands. And of that great Multitude, there was but a very few that did it: So that it was manifest they were not satisfied with what he had said.

Mr. Williams. Is it Nonsense then to say, that any Infants belong to the Kingdom of Glory?

Mr. Leigh. Yes, while they are in their Infant State; for when arrived to Glory, they are perfect as grown men, whatever they were on Earth. Otherwise we must say that there are Infants of two foot long, poor, weak, ignorant things in Glory: Therefore it must be thus taken, for we must make good Sense of Scripture.

Mr. Williams. I deny your *minor*, and shall form an opposite Argument thus:

If Infants are neither Members of the Universal visible Church, nor yet of a particular constituted Church, then they are not members of the visible Church at all:

But they are neither members of the Universal visible Church, nor yet of a particular constituted Church:

Therefore they are not members of the visible Church at all.

Mr. Leigh *took no notice of this Argument, but said,* It did not belong to a Respondent to form an Argument.

To which Mr. Williams *reply'd,* My Work is to clear the Truth; I will not be ty'd up to your Rules of Disputation.

Mr. Robinson required an express prohibition of Infants Church membership.

Mr. Williams *reply'd,* That is fine indeed; Pray give us an express prohibition of baptizing with Cream, and Spittle, and Salt, and Oyl; and the use of the Cross in Baptism: (all which you reject) and of many things more that might be brought into the Worship of God. *And to this no Reply was made.*

Mr. Leigh *insisting again upon his Argument for excluding Infants out of the Kingdom of Heaven, from* Matth. 19. *affirming,* that

that from thence it was Nonsense to say, they were the Subjects of Glory.

Mr. William said, We must distinguish between a Title to Glory, and the actual Enjoyment of Glory. Elect Infants have a Title to Glory, by Virtue of the Righteousness of Christ imputed unto them; although they are not actually in it.

In the next place Mr. *Williams* denied the *major*, and proved to him from *Matth.* 3. 7. That Church-Membership could not be the ground of Baptism; because those many Pharisees and others, that came and offer'd themselves to *John* for Baptism, were Church Members; And yet *John* denied to admit them to Baptism.

Here Mr. Leigh *distinguished between Church Members* de jure, *and such that were only so* de facto.

Mr. Williams asked him, whether he did own them to be Church-Members *de facto*.

His Answer was, He did.

Then Mr. Williams *told him* Church-Membership could not be the ground of Baptism.

Mr. Leigh said, They were not so *de jure*, because they were a Generation of *Vipers*, and therefore ought by the Law to have been cast out.

But when Mr. *Williams* did desire him to tell him where that Law was written, he could not produce it.

Upon this Dr. *Russel* asked Mr. *Leigh*, what Relation this Argument of his had to the Commission? For he did not know that they were obliged to follow them any longer in answering such Impertinencies, that were not at all included in the Question. And therefore desired him to produce some Argument that was more consonant to the Point in Question, for this was foreign to it. For we have granted you more than you seem willing to desire, in favour of Infants; namely, That they have a Title both to Grace here, and Glory hereafter, through the Merits of Christ and his Righteousness imputed to them. And yet we cannot allow that they are the Subjects of Baptism, according to Christ's Commission; or, a Part of the visible Church. Nevertheless we have very charitable Thoughts towards them, because we believe their Salvation is secured to them another way.

Mr. Leigh *then proceeds to another Argument:*

If Infants are Disciples, then they have a Right to Baptism according to the Commission:

But Infants are Disciples:

Ergo, They have a Right to Baptism according to the Commission

Mr. Williams denied the *minor*.

In

In defence of which, they argued from *Acts.* 15. 10. after this manner.

If those upon whom the Yoke of Circumcision was imposed after the manner of *Moses*, were called Disciples, and the manner of *Moses* was to Circumcise Infants; then Infants are called Disciples.

But those upon whom the Yoke of Circumcision was imposed after the manner of *Moses*, were called Disciples, and the manner of *Moses* was to circumcise Infants:

Ergo, Infants are called Disciples.

Dr Russel. I both distinguish upon your *major*, and deny the Consequence thereof. For I hope you understand a difference betwixt the *Manner* of performing an Action, and the *Subjects* upon whom it is performed.

The *Manner* of *Moses* is the thing here spoken of; which was to cut off the Foreskin of the Flesh with a Knife, a sharp Stone, or the like Instrument: And this was sometimes practised upon grown Persons, and sometimes upon Infants. As touching Infants, they are neither expressed, nor intended in the Scripture you have alledged. For they are called Brethren, Believing Gentiles, such that had an Epistle sent to them and when they heard it read, they rejoiced at the Consolation, were established in the Faith, and are called Churches; which your selves know (in those Times) consisted of Adult Persons, Multitudes both of Men and Women. But not of one Infant that we read of among them. And indeed, none of those forementioned Characters can agree to little Infants.

Mr. *Leigh.* I grant the Manner is there spoken of, and the Subjects brought in afterwards. But would not the People conclude that Infants were intended, if I tell them it must be done after the manner of *Moses*?

Dr. Russel. It's no matter what those People conclude, that know not how to distinguish between the Subjects, and the Manner. But those of whom this was spoken, knew right well, that the false Teachers imposed it upon the Gentiles that did believe: And they are the Subjects here spoken of.

Mr. Leigh. I would form this Argument

If those are called Disciples who are advised by Judaizing Christians to be circumcised after the Manner of *Moses*, then Infants are called Disciples:

But they are called Disciples that are advised so to be Circumcised:

Ergo, Infants are called Disciples.

Dr. Russel denies the Consequence of the *major*, for it doth not follow that because Adult Believers who are the Subjects

there spoken of (as is already proved) are call'd Disciples; that therefore Infants, who are neither expressed, nor intended, must be so call'd. For Mr. *Leigh* hath allowed the Distinction betwixt the Subjects, and the Manner.

Mr. Leigh. Read the first Verse, and you will find, that there came Men from *Judea*, that taught the Gentile Church that believed, That unless they were circumcised after the Manner of *Moses*, they could not be saved, *&c.* It was the Yoke of Circumcision here intended.

Whereupon *Mr. Williams* did deny, that barely Circumcision was that intolerable Yoke, which neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear, that is there spoken of by *Peter.* For Circumcision, barely considered Children of Eight Days old were able to bear it, and did bear it.

But Circumcision, as it obliged to the Law in Point of Justification, was that intolerable Yoke, which neither they, nor their Fathers were able to bear. For the Apostle tells the *Galatians*, That if they were circumcised, Christ should profit them nothing; and that they were bound to keep the whole Law.

Now, altho' Circumcision, barely considered, might be imposed on Infants; yet the false Doctrine in which that intolerable Yoke did consist, together with Circumcision, could not be imposed on Children.

Besides, that Circumcision, after the Manner of *Moses*, did not respect the Subjects, but the Form. It was the Brethren that were the Subjects the false Teachers would have had to have been circumcised after the Manner of *Moses*; amongst which, Children could not be numbred.

For, 1*st.* They were such Brethren that had received the Holy Ghost.

2*dly.* They had purified their Hearts by Faith.

3*dly.* They were such that from among the Gentiles were turned to God.

Then they went off also from this, and said, Infants are part of a Nation, and therefore might be baptized.

Mr. Williams replied, Though Children are part of a Nation; yet not of a Nation modify'd according to Christ's Commission.

Whereupon their Moderator said, He thought Mr *Williams* had but little Academical Learning.

Mr. *Williams* replied, He was warned by the Word, to have a care of vain Philosophy. And presently demanded, what was the Antecedent to the Relative *them*, in the Commission.

The Moderator making no answer, Mr. *Williams* said, It was all Nations Discipled.

And upon this. *Dr. Russel*, and *Mr. Williams* bid both desire them to produce one Instance for Infant Baptism, out of the Word of God. And this they did very many times desire of them, but no Instance was produced. At length Mr. *Williams* desired them, in these Words:

Brethren, I would beg you to produce one Instance for Infants Baptism; it will reflect upon you if you do not. What will all this People say, when they are gone? So many times one Instance desired: So many Ministers here, and not one Instance produced: They must needs conclude there was not one to be produced.

Notwithstanding this, the Ministers were all silent; and not a Man did reply to it.

Then *Mr. Leigh* said, We might take up the Opponency again if we pleased.

Thus ended their so much boasted of Opponency, in that vain-glorious Advertisement, published in the Post man, the *Saturday* morning after the Dispute, (either by one of themselves, or of their unthinking Admirers) before *Dr Russel* could return to *London*, altho' he set forth from *Portsmouth* the next morning after the Dispute; his pressing Occasions necessitating him thereto.

Dr. Russel did then, at *Mr. Leigh*'s Request, reassume the Opponency, of which *Mr. Leigh* seemed to be sick, and was willing to get rid of it. Which was a sign they had no mind to inform the People of the Grounds upon which they keep up the Practice of Infants Baptism; when they had so fair an Opportunity put into their Hands to do it, and made no better Improvement of it. But having no Scripture Proof for it, they were not willing to let so great an Auditory know the true Cause why they continue such a Scriptureless Practice; to say no worse of it.

Dr. Russel. I will therefore prove, that no Infants are to be baptized by Virtue of Christ's Commission.

If αὐτὸς hath no other Antecedent agreeing therewith but μαθητεύσατε, then none are to be baptized but such as are first made Disciples by the Ministry of men, which Infants are not capable of.

But the Antecedent is true; as is also the Consequence; and therefore no Infants are to be baptized.

Mr. Leigh. I deny that αὐτὸς hath no other Antecedent but μαθητεύσατε. *Dr. Russel.*

Dr. Russel. If there be another, pray assign it.

Mr. Leigh I say it is πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, All Nations.

Dr. Russel. That cannot possibly be: because αὐτὰς, *Them*, is of the Masculine Gender, and πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, *all Nations*, is of the Neuter Gender. But αὐτὰς *Them*, doth very well agree with μαθητὰς, *Disciples*, they being both of the Masculine Gender.

To this they gave no solid Answer, worthy of noting down, according to my remembrance, or the Notaries Observation.

Dr. Russel having observed what evasive Answers they had given to his own and Mr *Williams*'s Arguments, was resolved to force them to a direct Answer (if possible) by retorting their own Allegation upon themselves, that they might see the Absurdity of it: and this put them into a flame, and great confusion.

The Argument was this.

If Infants are capable to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of Men, without the use of Reason, then the Beasts of the Field are also capable: but the Beasts of the Field are not capable: therefore Infants are not capable.

Upon this there was a great Disorder among them, and a Person in the Company cried out, *He speaks Blasphemy.* But one of the Ministers that sat by him was so just, as to satisfie him to the contrary; for which he deserves Thanks.

But *Mr. Robinson*, their Moderator, stood up, and threw himself about, making a noise like one in a delirious Paroxysm; and bid the People take notice, that Dr. *Russel* had ranked their Infants among the brute Beasts; and that if they became of his Opinion, they must look upon them as Dogs, or Cats, or Hogs, *&c.* with much more of the same sort of Rhetorick; endeavouring all he could to enrage the multitude of unthinking Persons against him, and put the People into a Confusion.

Upon this Mr. *Sharp*, the Baptist Moderator, stood up, and said, Gentlemen hold! what is to do now? What, doth Colonel *Self* ride Lord General in the Town of *Portsmouth* to day? What is the reason of this?

Dr. Russel. Hold, Mr. *Robinson.* Must I be thus misrepresented to the People, because I say (that which you all know to be true) that Infants want the use of Reason? I hope you will be quiet a little time, and give me leave to make my Defence to the People against your clamorous Expressions.

I am now put upon a necessity to tell this Assembly (of honourable Persons, and others) what my Thoughts are concerning the State of mankind in general, and of little Infants in particular.

I believe that man, as he came out of the hands of God, was a noble Creature, the top Perfection of all his Creation here below and was substituted Lord of this lower World; was endowed with the Image of his Maker, both Natural and Divine.

But by his Sin he lost the Divine Image and brought himself thereby under the Curse, and into a State of Condemnation, in which his Posterity were also involved.

But it pleased God of his Infinite mercy, not to leave him in that miserable Estate, as he had left the fallen Angels. But Christ interposed between Justice and the inner the Promise being made before the Sentence was pronounced, *Gen.* 3 15. *That the seed of the Woman should bruise the Serpents head.* And this promised Seed hath (through the Grace of God) opened a door of mercy for little Infants, who never sinned in their own persons; as well as for others.

And you know, Gentlemen, I have already told you how great an Esteem I have for your little Infants; that I will rather believe that all Infants dying in their Infancy are elected, than I will conclude that any one of them are damn'd: And this is more than I could persuade our Opposites to confess, although they were urged upon it.

So that (for ought yet appears) we have a greater esteem for your tender Babes than these Gentlemen have, notwithstanding *Mr Robinson*'s unreasonable Clamour against me. And having thus Apologized for my self, I do now expect an Answer to my Argument.

Mr. Robinson. What a strange thing is this, to talk of baptizing the Beasts of the Field! Who ever did so?

Dr Russel. I am so far from talking of baptizing the Beasts of the Field, that my Argument is rather to prove the direct contrary. And whereas you affirm that Infants have a Capacity to be made Disciples of Christ by the Ministry of men (or else you have been saying nothing to the purpose all this time about it) I bring this to shew you the Absurdity of such a Notion: And you are bound to shew the Disparity, or confess you cannot.

Sirs, I would put this Case to you. Suppose there were twenty or thirty new-born Infants in a Room, and you should chuse out the most able and learned Person among you to preach to them, in order to make them Disciples according to Christ's Commission; I believe he would have no better Success than St. *Anthony* had (as the Story goes) when he took upon him to instruct the Pigs; or, as some others have done (even Popish Saints) who have took upon them to preach to

the

the Fowls of the Air, &c. of which I could furnish you with divers Instances.

But why should Mr. *Robinson* think it strange that any body should have such a conceit in their minds? Doth he not know that the Church of *Rome* baptize things of an inferiour Nature? for they baptize Churches and Bells.

And if I had compared your Practice to theirs of baptizing Bells, you had had no reason to complain, for they are both passive in the Act; only if you will give credit to one of the Fathers (viz. *Augustine*) the Bells are upon that account the fittest Subjects, for they are wholly passive: but (saith he) the little Children are not so: for they shew their Resistance by their Crying. And now I demand of any of you to take off the Retortion, and shew the Disparity if you can.

Upon this they were all silent, and none of them would undertake to shew the Disparity: and till they do it, my Retortion will remain upon them.

Then Mr. *Leigh* said, It is time to proceed to the other Question.

Dr. Russel. I will now enter upon it.

The second Question is this:

Whether the Ordinance of Baptism, as appointed by Christ, is to be administred by Dipping, Plunging, (or) *Overwhelming only, and not otherwise?*

I take the Question in the Affirmative, and my first Argument is this.

Arg. 1. The Holy Scripture shews us the right way of Baptizing, as appointed by Christ:

But it doth not shew us that it ought to be done by Sprinkling:

Ergo, Sprinkling is not the right way of Baptizing.

Mr. *Leigh.* Sir, you must bring in that Dipping is absolutely necessary (as in the Question.) What do you talk of Sprinkling for?

Dr. Russel. Sir, I know not of any other way that is practised by you; nor, I suppose, any of these People: I conclude they have often seen you sprinkle Infants; and Mr. *Chandler* hath particularly recommended it in his Preaching, as the best way of baptizing: and I hope you are not asham'd of your Practice.

But if you will disown Sprinkling to be the right way of Baptizing, I am contented; I will not then insist upon it.

Mr. Robinson We are not discoursing of that now; you are to prove Dipping to be the only way; and you must and shall prove it.

Dr. Ruſſel. Muſt and Shall! Muſt and Shall is for the King, and not for Mr. *Robinſon.*

Mr. *Leigh.* But we will not admit of this Argument, becauſe it hath not the word *Only* in it. You are to prove that your Way is the only right Way of Baptizing.

Dr. Ruſſel. Mr. *Leigh* was pleaſed to make uſe of an Argument of Induction upon the Queſtion about the *Subjects*: and why may not I uſe the ſame Liberty about the *Manner*, and prove it by Arguments of Inductions?

Upon this ſome of them fell a laughing, and Mr *Chandler* thus expreſt himſelf; *Your Induction is an Induction like the man's Covey of Partridges,*

Mr. *Williams* ask'd him how many there was in the Covey?

Mr. *Chandler* ſaid, Why there was but one.

Mr. *Williams* replied, But there was more a hatching.

Dr Ruſſel What is the Reaſon of all this? I tell you I will make it good by Arguments of Induction: And if you do not underſtand my meaning, I will inform you, and ſhew that it is a good way of arguing, and will anſwer the End I bring it for.

For, I will firſt argue off your way of Sprinkling; and after that, if you ſhall aſſign a *Third* way, that is neither practiſed by you nor us, I will then argue that off alſo: and then (I hope) I ſhall fully prove what I deſign by it; namely, that ours is the *only* right way of baptizing.

Upon this they readily diſcerned they ſhould be forced to give an inſtance from Scripture for their Practice of Sprinkling, which they were conſcious to themſelves they were not able to do: and therefore utterly refuſed to anſwer the Argument.

Dr. Ruſſel If this Argument will not be admitted, I will proceed to another.

That Way which doth not ſignifie that which ought to be repreſented in Baptiſm, according to Chriſt's Appointment, is not the right way of baptizing.

But this your pretended way doth not do:

Ergo, It is not the right way of baptizing.

And this I ſhall make good by the following Syllogiſm.

If that Baptiſm which was appointed by Chriſt doth properly repreſent his Burial and Reſurrection and ours by him, then it muſt be done not by Sprinkling, but by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming the Perſon baptized into Water:

But that *Baptiſm* which was appointed by Chriſt doth properly repreſent his Burial and Reſurrection, and ours by him:

Ergo, It muſt be done not by Sprinkling, but by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming the Perſon baptized into Water.

Mr.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the consequence of the *major*; that it properly sets forth a Burial and a Resurrection. It is not for this Reason the *only* Way; and I deny that this Way doth only set forth a Burial and a Resurrection.

Dr Russel. Then I will prove,

1. That it doth truly represent a Burial and a Resurrection. And,

2. That it is the only right way of practising this Ordinance

1. That it doth represent a Burial and a Resurrection, I prove from *Rom. 6.* and *Colos. 2.* In *Rom. 6. 4. Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into death that like as Christ was raised up*, &c, *Colos. 2. 12. Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him*, &c.

This cannot be understood literally; for so they were not, could not be buried with him in his Sepulchre, neither can we. But the Apostle resolves us how this was done, and how they were, and we may, be buried with him, and also rise with him, and that is by Baptism. *Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him* Therefore Baptism is to be performed in such a way that represents a Burial and a Resurrection; which is most aptly represented by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming the Person baptized, into the Water, and raising him up again out of it.

2. That this is the only right way of performing this Ordinance, I prove thus:

If there were no other way practised by *John the Baptist*, Christ, nor his Apostles, but what did represent a Burial and a Resurrection, then ours is the only right way of baptizing.

But there was no other way practised by *John the Baptist*, Christ, nor his Apostles, but what did represent a Burial and a Resurrection:

Ergo, Ours is the only right way of baptizing.

Mr. Chandler. You are to prove, that because Baptism is significant of a Burial and Resurrection, therefore it must be done only by dipping.

Dr. Russel. By this Mr. *Chandler* grants that Baptism doth signifie a Burial and Resurrection; and I have already proved that therefore it is the only right way of baptizing that we practise because there was no other practised in those first Times of the Gospel. And till he gives an Instance to the contrary, my Proof stands good.

But I shall farther prove it by this Argument.

If there can no Instance be given that ever the Apostles did baptize other ways than by dipping, then ours is the right Way of baptizing.

But

But there can be no Instance given, that ever the Apostles did baptize other ways than by dipping:

Ergo, Ours is the right way of baptizing.

Mr. Leigh. I deny the Enumeration in your Argument; for it doth not follow, that because the Apostles did not practise it any other way, that there were no others that did. For there were divers other Ministers in those Times, besides the Apostles that did also baptize.

Dr. Russel. By this you grant that the Apostles of our Lord did not practise Baptism any other way than by dipping. And to prove that no others did use a different Practice, I thus argue.

If we have no Account in Holy Scripture, that either the Apostles, or any other Ministers in those Times, did baptize any one Person otherways than by dipping, then dipping is the only right way of baptizing.

But we have no Account in Holy Scripture, that either the Apostles, or any other Ministers in those Times, did baptize any one Person other ways than by dipping:

Ergo, Dipping is the only right way of baptizing.

Mr. Chandler. I can shew there is another way that it might be done, and not by Dipping; and that from the Etymology of the word *Baptizo*, for it signifies also *to wash*.

Dr. Russel. I remember what *Alstedius* saith in his *Lexicon Theologicum*. Having before been speaking about the Etymology of that word; *Illud* Βαπτίζειν *tantum significat immergere, non lavare, nisi ex consequenti*; and therefore it signifies *to wash* only in a secondary and remote sense, because things that are dipp'd, may be said to be wash'd. But the proper and primary Signification of *Baptizo* is, *to dip*; for it comes from Βάπτω, *mergo, immergo, to dip, to plunge, to overwhelm, to dip into*, &c.

Mr. Chandler. I own that Βάπτω signifies *mergo, immergo*. But I can shew great probability, that many, in Scripture times, were baptized by pouring a little Water on the Face; and there is no Certainty that Dipping was ever used.

Dr. Russel. How doth that appear?

Mr. Leigh. We will argue on a Probability. It might be done other ways than by dipping; and a Probability is the most you can pretend to for dipping. I require you to prove that dipping was certainly intended in those places you bring for it; and then I will prove, that dipping was not intended, but only an Application of Water to the Person.

Dr. Russel. The first Instance I shall give is the Baptism of our Saviour, as it is expresst in *Mark* 1. 9. *Jesus came from Nazareth of Galilee, and was baptized of John in Jordan.* The words are,

are, Καὶ ἐβαπτίσθη ὑπὸ Ἰωάννου εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην. Which Words do certainly signifie, that he was Dipped *into* Jordan.

Mr. Leigh. The Word εἰς signifies *in*, as well as *into*, and is often so Translated in the New Testament.

Dr. Russel. That it may sometimes so signify where the Scope of the place may shew it, I will not contend. But you know very well, that where it is joined with an Accusative (as it is here) it signifies *into*. And I can shew that our Translators have so rendred it in many places in the New Testament. And it would many times be Nonsence to understand it otherwise. I will give you some Instances of it, in the room of many that might be given.

As in *John* 3. 17. *God sent not his Son* into the *World to condemn the World; but that the World through him might be saved.* Here εἰς is rendred *into*: For the Words in the Greek are εἰς τὸν κόσμον; and I hope you will not deny that God sent Christ *into* the World.

And in 1 *Tim.* 1. 15. *Christ Jesus came into the World to save Sinners*, &c. There εἰς is also Translated *into*. And I hope you will not deny, *that Christ came into the World to save Sinners.* It's joined with the same Words as in *John* 3. 17. before recited.

And in *Luke* 4. 16. it's said, *He went* into *the Synagogue on the Sabbath-day, and stood up for to read.* Here again it is so rendred; for the Words are, εἰς τὴν συναγωγὴν, into *the Synagogue. And the eyes of all them that were in the Synagogue were fastned on him*, ver. 20. which could not have been, had he not gone *into* the Synagogue; as it's manifest he did. And I hope you will not deny that Christ went into the Synagogue: But you may do it with as much colour of Reason, as to say he was not Dip'd or Plunged of *John* into the River of *Jordan*, when the same Word is used in the same Sense. And besides, if we do but consider those multitudes that *John* Baptized in the River of *Jordan*, and other places where there was much Water; we have no reason to doubt of the Truth thereof.

Mr. Leigh. We allow, that what cannot be now used without being burdensome, might be more commodious in that Day, and observed in that hot Country of *Judæa*, when there was so many came to *John* to be Baptized; and therefore it may be that they went out to Rivers. But I will argue upon a Probability. It is well known, in those hot Countries the People wore Sandals; and they might go *into* the Water a little way to wash their Feet. Now I offer this fair Interpretation: They might step a little way *into* Jordan for Ease and Refreshment, and then *John* might pour a little Water on them.

Now allow but the Word Βαπτίζω to signifie *to wash*, as we can easily prove it is often so taken in Scripture; and I offer to all the Company, whether this be not a fair Interpretation of the Place, That *John* washed him with Water, he going a little way into *Jordan*.

Dr. Russel. Notwithstanding this Flourish of a pretended Probability, you know that the Word Βαπτίζω doth properly signify *to Dip*, as all the great Lexicographers and Criticks do tell us; and that its proper and native Signification is to Dip *into* Water, or to Plunge under Water; and that I could give you many Instances of, out of *Scapula*, *Stephanus*, *Schrevelius*, and many others. And they also tell us, That if it be used for Washing, it is in a remote Sense; and if it be taken in its primary Sense, it's such a washing as is by Dipping or Plunging into the Water, and being covered therewith.

But that you may see I am not singular in my Opinion, I will shew you that your own Expositors do thus render it, and some of the greatest Men among the Protestants that ever wrote since the Reformation; of which I have made a Collection out of their own Works, because I would not wrong them.

I shall begin with the Testimony of those Learned and Judicious Divines of your own Perswasion, who were those that continued Mr. *Pool*'s Annotations upon *Matth.* 3. 6. These are their own Words, *Were Baptized*, that is, *Dipped in Jordan.*

Upon *John* 3. 22, 23. There *John* was Baptizing, because this *Ænon* was a Brook or River that had *much* Water. It is from this apparent, that both Christ and *John* Baptized by Dipping the Body in the Water; else they need not have sought Places where had been a great plenty of Water.

Before Dr. *Russel* had read this last Sentence wholly out, the Presbyterian Ministers, even Mr. *Leigh* himself, as well as the rest of them, fell a hissing so loud, and set others of their Party to make a noise also by their ill Example, that altho Dr. *Russel* went on with his Work, yet the Noise was so great, that it wholly drowned his Voice, that he could not be heard.

Whereupon Mr. *Sharp* the Moderator, call'd out aloud to still this great Noise, and spoke to this effect: What is the reason of this Hissing? Gentlemen, are you not ashamed? You preach to others the Doctrine of Sanctification and Self-denial, and to act thus your selves, I am asham'd to see it. I pray, good People, take no notice of it now.

When Dr. *Russel* perceived they would not forbear this Hissing and uncivil Carriage, he forbore to read any farther. And when Silence was obtained, he addressed himself to the Ministers after this manner:

Sirs,

Sirs, What is the matter with you? Must I not be permitted to recite your own Authors, and some of the greatest Men that have written since the Reformation? Although their Testimony against us is of little value, because they are Parties in the Controversie; yet when the clear evidence of Truth shall enforce a Confession from their Pens that we are in the right, it is then a great Testimony for us.

Here is first of all *Pool*'s Annotators, certain learned and judicious Divines, that say in that matter as we do: and they are Men of your own Party. There is also Dr. *Hammond* saith the same.

Here the *Doctor* was interrupted again, and they cried out, What do you tell us of Dr. *Hammond?* What have we to do with Dr. *Hammond?*

Dr. Russel. Why certainly, Gentlemen, Dr. *Hammond* is not thus to be despised upon his Judgment about a Greek word. I have also Mr. *Baxter*, *Wollebius*, *Tilenus*, the Learned *Perkins*, and *Luther* also, who was against Sprinkling, and practised Dipping; and so did the rest of the Divines at *Wittenburg*. Mr. *Calvin* also, although he did allow a Liberty of Sprinkling in cold Climates, yet he saith as I do as to the Signification of the word *Baptizo*, that it signifies *to Dip*, and was so used in the Primitive Church.

There is also the *Dutch* Translators, they do every where render the words that are used to express this Ordinance by, as we do; and they call *John the Baptist*, Joannes de Dooper, *John the Dipper*. And I know not of any place but it's so expressed. And these are Presbyterians, Men of your own Religion.

Upon this, one of the Ministers said, What! do you understand *Dutch?*

Dr. Russel said, Yes, he understood it, but he could not speak it readily.

They replied, We will try that; for we have a Gentleman here that understands *Dutch* very well.

Dr. Russel. You may ask that Gentleman if you think fit; he can satisfie you, that what I say is true. But they had more Discretion than to call the Gentleman out to confute themselves.

Dr. Russel. I have also the Testimony of the *Dutch* Annotators, who say the same thing. And these also are Men of your own Perswasion.

And, to add no more, I have also the Testimony of the Assembly of Divines, sitting at *Westminster:* And I hope they may be of some credit with you.

But they would not suffer him to proceed in the Reading thereof to the People; but cried out, We are Protestants, and will not pin our Faith on other Mens sleeves.

Dr. Russel. What! not the Assembly of Divines? I thought, though you had no regard to my words, you might have had some regard to the Assembly of Divines. You know I do not wrong these Authors: And therefore what must the People think of you, to oppose your selves thus against these great Men, and such multitudes of them, that are of your own Persuasion (as many of them are) and the rest, some of the greatest Men since the Reformation. Surely the People cannot take it kindly at your hands, to reject the Authority of these Men in a matter of this Nature.

Their Answer was We do reverence these Divines, but adhere to what they say no farther than it agrees with the Word of God.

Dr. Russel. We say, that in this Particular, what they have written doth agree with the Word of God.

Mr. Leigh. You have recourse to the prime Signification of the Word, whereas we must take it according to its Acceptation in Scripture. And I offer it to the Consideration of the Learned, whether the prime Signification of the Word be a sufficient Argument in this case? And here he makes his Rhetorical Excursions about a Mathematician, an Angel, a Footboy that carries a Letter, a Physician, *&c.* and concludes thus, but we must go to the Scripture Acceptation of the Word. And I challenge you to bring one place of Scripture where it must be understood that it was done by Dipping.

Dr. Russel. It is very well, Mr. *Leigh* will allow that I have given the People the proper Meaning of the word Βαπτίζω, and that its prime Signification is *to Dip.* Now he might have spared all the rest that he hath said; for we do not lay the stress only upon the Etymology of the World, but also upon the concurrent Testimonies of Holy Scripture, that it was so understood and so practised by *John the Baptist*, Christ, and his Apostles, and so represented by the Metaphors made use of (as a Burial and a Resurrection) to set it forth by: as also their chooſing places where there was much Water to Baptize in, as I have already shewed, so far as they would permit me; and should have made it manifest beyond exception, if I might have been heard.

But to answer your Demand, I alledge *Acts* 8. 38, 39. *And they went both down into the Water, both* Philip *and the* Eunuch, *and he Baptized him. And when they were come up out of the Water,* &c. Here we have an account, that both the Administrator,

tor, and the Person to be Baptized, went both down into the Water: and when they came there, he Baptized him. And if *Philip* had not been to put the *Eunuch* into the Water, and cover him with it, why should they go down both into the Water? A little of it might have been brought up to them into the Chariot, if Sprinkling would have served the turn. But it appears manifestly, that nothing less would serve for to answer the Commission, but to Dip the Person Baptized into the Water, otherwise they did that which was wholly needless, and besides the Rule that was given them to practise by. And their coming up again out of the Water, doth evidently shew that he was Plunged into it, and overwhelm'd with it.

Mr. *Leigh* replied, That the Greek word signified to go down *to*, and come up *from* the Water.

Mr. Williams replied, That there was two differing Words (as he had been informed) in the Greek Text; as there are two different Words in the Translation. For it is said, *As they went on their way, they came* unto *a certain Water:* This was before he proposed for Baptism. But when a Grant was given him that he might be Baptized, it is then said, *They went down both of them* into *the Water, and* Philip *Baptized him there.* Now, as they are different Words in the Translation, coming *unto* and going *down into*, even so they are differing Words in the Greek.

Dr. Russel said, They were two different Words; to which Mr. *Leigh* conceased.

But after the Meeting was over, Mr. *Williams* the Presbyterian Minister, in whose Meeting place the Dispute was, told Mr. *Williams* the Baptist Disputant, he was in the right, and that they were two differing Words in the Greek; one for coming *unto*, the other for going down *into*.

Dr. Russel. I then farther argue:

If the Spirit of God doth never use the Word Ῥάντισμα where the Ordinance of Baptism is mentioned, but always expresses it by Βάπτισμα; then it was performed by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only: But the Spirit of God doth never use the word Ῥάντισμα where the Ordinance of Baptism is mentioned, but always expresses it by Βάπτισμα;

Ergo, It was performed by Dipping, Plunging, or Overwhelming only.

Mr. Chandler. I deny the Sequel of the *Major*; because the Word doth sometimes signifie a Washing that is short of Dipping.

Dr. Russel. You must then assign your Instance.

Mr. Chandler. You must know that Βαπτίζω comes from טבל *Tabal.* And I will shew that it denotes such a Washing as is short of Dipping. And in *Dan.* 4. 33. where it is said of Nebuchadnezzar, *His body was wet with the dew of Heaven*; the *Septuagint* render it Βαπτίζω: so that it cannot be understood in your sense.

Dr. Russel. That Βαπτίζω is used in the stead of *Tabal*, is true. But how do you know that the Word was so Rendred by the *Septuagint?*

Mr. Chandler. It is so in that Translation that goes in their Name.

Dr. Russel. That I deny; for the Word there is *Ebaphe*, and not *Baptizo.* But do you not know what *Weemes* saith in his *Christian Synagogue*, That the *Septuagint* Translation was burnt, and only some Fragments of it remaining, which was made up by others: so that neither you nor I know when we read the *Septuagint*, and when we read other Men. But what doth all this signify? That is but a Translation, and I think ours to be much better than that, if it were as you say; and more agreeable to the scope of the place, to say *his body was wet with the dew of Heaven*, than to say *it was dipt with the dew of Heaven.*

But I pray let Mr. *Chandler* tell us how it is in the *Hebrew*, which is the Language in which it was written.

Mr. Chandler. The Word in the Hebrew is *Tabal.*

Dr. Russel. That I deny.

Whereupon an Hebrew Bible was produced, and handed up to Dr. *Russel*: And the Book of *Daniel* not being placed in its right Order, as in other Hebrew Bibles, he did not readily find it; whereupon they cry'd out, They believ'd he could not read it. The Dr. answered, He could read Hebrew before Mr. *Chandler* was born: and as a demonstration of it, he read a Verse or two in the beginning thereof. Upon this Mr. *Robinson* took the Book and with some difficulty found out the Book of *Daniel*, and then gave it to Dr. *Russel* again, who read the Place by them directed to, and told Mr. *Chandler* that the Word *Tabal* was not there. And then, after all this needless trouble, Mr. *Chandler* did confess that it was not: and so all his Pretension from thence vanished into Smoak.

Mr. *Chandler* also urged for another instance, to prove that *Tabal* signified a Washing less than that by Dipping, 2 *Kings* 5. 10, 14. *Go and wash in Jordan, and be clean.* And in Verse 14. *He dipped himself in Jordan.* Now this must signifie a Washing short of Dipping; because though *Tabal* doth express the Act done in Ver. 14. yet the Command is given by *Rachatz*, which signifies *to wash.*

Dr.

Dr. Ruſſel. I do allow that the Command is expreſt by *Rachatz*, and alſo that it ſometimes is uſed, as well as *Caban*, to ſignifie leſs than Dipping when it is applied to ſome particular things, or parts of things, which are to be cleanſed from Filth; as you know νίπτω in the Greek is *to waſh the Hands*.

But where *Rachatz* in the Hebrew is uſed in the Sence as it is here expreſt, namely, *to waſh himſelf*; is is always to be underſtood of ſuch a Waſhing as is by Dipping. The *Jews* underſtood it ſo, and *Naaman* the *Syrian* underſtood the Prophet in that Sence; for it is ſaid, he dipped himſelf in *Jordan* ſeven times. And that he was not miſtaken about it, is evident; for that the Spirit of God hath left it upon Record, that what he did was according to the Saying of the Man of God: ſo that the Prophet did not intend by *Rachatz* any other Waſhing than what is performed by Dipping of the Perſon ſo waſhed into the Water. And had this been a Derivative, there might have been ſome doubt raiſed about it; but ſeeing *Tabal* is the Root it ſelf, it can ſignify nothing leſs than what is the known ſence thereof, *viz.* He Dipped. He dipped himſelf in *Jordan* ſeven times, according to the Saying of the Man of God. Thus I have cleared this Text from your Objection, as not intending any ſuch thing as you have brought it for, but the direct contrary.

Then Mr. *Chandler* ſaid, We challenge you to prove, by Scripture, that the Word *Baptizo* ſignifies *to Dip*, and that *that* is intended by Baptiſm.

Dr. Ruſſel. I will prove it from all the Places where the Ordinance of *Baptiſm* is ſpoken of, if you will let me prove it from the Greek.

Mr. Chandler. No, you ſhall prove it from our Tranſlation, that it is there any where ſo rendred; but you ſhall not do it from any of thoſe Places where the Ordinance of *Baptiſm* is ſpoken of.

Dr. Ruſſel. That is unreaſonable, that when the Uſe of a Word is enquired into, and what was the Practice of the firſt Miniſters, purſuant to that Word by which they are commanded to Baptize; for all thoſe Scriptures where it is ſo mentioned to be excluded out of our Enquiry.

Mr. Chandler. I will not allow you to prove it from any of thoſe Places where the Ordinance of Baptiſm is either expreſt or intended.

Dr. Ruſſel. If nothing elſe will do with you, I will then undertake to prove from divers places in Scripture, that either *Bapto*, or its Derivatives, is ſo rendred in our *Engliſh* Tranſlation.

The

The first Scripture I shall instance in, is,

Rev. 19. 13. *He was cloathed with a Vesture dipped in Blood.*

Mr. Chandler. This is not *Bapto.*

Dr. Russel. No more is *Baptizo*, *Baptismos*, *Baptisma*, &c. but they are all Derivatives from it; and so is the Word that is here used. And this Mr. *Chandler* did not deny.

Dr. Russel did then urge the several Places in the Evangelists about *Judas* dipping with Christ in the Dish; as, Matt. 26. 23. *He that dippeth.* Mark 14. 20. John 13. 26. *When I have dipped it. And when he had dipped*, &c. Now in all these Places you see it's thus rendred, and the Ordinance of Baptism not in the least intended.

Moreover, I will give you one Instance more, in which the most minute Action imaginable is intended, and yet so much as was put into the Water is said to be dipt.

Luke 16. 24. Where the rich Man being in Hell, desired Father *Abraham* to send *Lazarus*, that *he might dip the tip of his Finger in Water, to cool his Tongue*, &c.

By this it appears, that our Translators did thus understand the Word to intend Dipping; and have never rendred it to Sprinkle in all the New Testament.

I would only add, That when Learned Men come to have but the same Wisdom as the *Jewish* Rabbies have, to reduce all doubtful Words to their Roots and Theme from whence they are deriv'd, then much of our present Disputes will issue in the Knowledge of the Truth; and we shall cease to strive about Words to no Profit, but to the subverting of the Hearers.

Upon this followed a confused Jangling and Noise, so that the Amanuensis could not take it down, neither did he think it worth the taking.

But Mr. *Williams*, the Presbyterian Minister, said, he thought there had been little said to the Purpose.

Upon this Dr. *Russel* said, Mr. *Williams*, I think there hath been a great deal said more than hath been answered; but if you are not satisfied, we will wave all that hath been said, and I will dispute it over with you *de novo*.

Mr. *Williams* shrugged, and answered, No; I am not very well.

Although he had not been engaged at all in the Dispute himself, and the Doctor had been fatigued by so long a Disputation, yet Mr. *Williams* refused to accept his Offer.

It was at last thought meet by them to put an Issue to the Disputation. And Mr. *Leigh* (after he had made a Speech to thank the Governour and the Mayor for their Civility towards them,

them, and the Baptists had returned their Thanks also) he then concluded in Prayer; and so dismist the Assembly. It was between the Hours of Six and Seven of the Clock when the Dispute ended.

I do now think it proper to give you an Account of those Learned Mens Testimonies to justifie our Practice of Dipping, which Dr. *Russel* was then prevented to recite, by reason of the Ministers Hissing, and the Noise and Clamour of their Party, that would not suffer him to be heard.

Pool's *Annotations.*

Matt. 3. 6. *Were Baptized*: that is, Dipped in *Jordan.*

Matt. 28. 19. It's true, the first Baptisms of which we read in Holy Writ, were by Dipping of the Persons Baptized. Where it may be we judge it reasonable, and most resembling our Burial with Christ by Baptism into Death.

John 3. 22, 23. There *John* was Baptizing, because this *Ænon* was a Brook or River that had much Water. It is from this apparent, that both Christ and *John* Baptized by Dipping the Body in the Water; else they need not have sought Places where had been a great Plenty of Water.

Acts 8. 38. In hot Countries this was usual, to Baptize by Dipping the Body in the Water.

Rom. 6. 4. He seems here to allude to the manner of Baptizing in those warm Eastern Countries, which was to Dip or Plunge the Party Baptized; and, as it were, to bury him for a while *under* Water.

Dr. Hammond's *Annotations.*

Matt. 3. *John* put the Persons whom he Baptized into the Water, Dipped them all over, and so took them out again. And in his Paraphrase on

Mark 1. 5. And *John*'s Baptism was done in *Jordan*, a River convenient for that Purpose.

The Learned Perkins.

Rom. 6. The ancient Custom of Baptizing was to dip, and as it were to dive all the Body of the Baptized in the Water; as may appear in *Paul*, *Rom.* 6. And the Councils of *Laodicea*, and *Neocæsarea*. The Action of the Minister, is his Washing of the Party Baptized with the Element of Water.

Of Washing there be three Parts: The putting into the Water, the continuance in the Water, and the coming out of the Water. *Perkins*'s Order of the Causes of Salvation and Damnation, *Cap.* 33. *Pag.* 74. *Vol.* 1.

And in his Comment on *Galat.* 3: 27. *Vol.* 2. *Pag.* 257. the Dipping of the Body signifies Mortification, or Fellowship with Christ in his Death: The staying under the Water, signifies the Burial of Sin: And the coming out of the Water, the Resurrection from Sin to Newness of Life.

And upon *Matth.* 28. 19. Here (saith he) a Question may be made, Whether Washing the Body in Baptism, must be by Dipping or Sprinkling? His Answer is this; In hot Countries, and in the Baptism of Men of Years, Dipping was used, and that by the Apostles: And to this *Paul* alludes, *Rom.* 6. 3, 4. And Dipping doth more fully represent our spiritual Washing, than Sprinkling. *Ibid. Pag.* 257.

Mr. Baxter, *in his Paraphrase.*

Matth. 3. 5. We grant that Baptism then was by washing the whole Body.

Matth. 3. 6. Baptism was in *John*'s time, by washing the whole Body.

Rom. 6. 4. Therefore in our Baptism we are dipped *under* the Water.

Coloss 2. 12. Ye are dead and buried with him; for so your Baptism signifies, in which ye are put under the Water, to signifie and profess that your Old Man, or fleshly Lust, is dead and buried with him; and you rise thence, to signifie and profess, that you rise to Newness of Life.

In his third Argument against Mr. *Blake*, he saith, *quoad modum*, with respect to the manner, It is commonly confest by us to the Anabaptists (as our Commentators declare) that in the Apostles time, the Baptized were dipped over Head in Water. And though we have thought it lawful to disuse the manner of Dipping, yet we presume not to change the Use and Signification of it.

Dr. *Cave.*

In his *Primitive Christianity*, Pag. 320. saith, That the Party Baptized was wholly immerged, or put under Water; which was the almost constant and universal Custom of those times whereby they did most notably and significantly express the great End and Effects of Baptism; for as in immerging there are in a manner three several Acts, the putting the Person into Water,

Water, his abiding there for some time, and his rising up again, thereby representing Christ's Death, Burial, and Resurrection, &c.

Dr. Nicholson, *late Lord Bishop of* Gloucester.

In his *Exposition of the Church-Catechism*, saith, in *Pag.* 174. And the ancient manner in Baptism, the putting the Person Baptized under the Water, and then taking him out again, did well set out these two Acts, the first his dying, the second his rising again. And in the same Page, upon *Col.* 2. 12. he saith, In the Grave with Christ we went not, for our Bodies were not, could not be buried with his; but in our Baptism, by a kind of Analogy or Resemblance, while our Bodies are *under* the Water, we may be said to be buried with him.

Dr. Fowler, *present Lord Bishop of* Gloucester.

In his *Scope of the Christian Religion*, upon *Rom.* 6. 4. saith, Christians being plunged into the Water in Baptism, signifieth their undertaking and obliging themselves, in a spiritual Sense, to die and be buried with Jesus Christ, that so answerably to his Resurrection, they may live a holy and godly Life.

Dr. Tillotson, *late Archbishop of* Canterbury.

In his *Sermon upon* 2 Tim. 2. 19. saith, Anciently those who were Baptized put off their Garments, which signified the putting off the Body of Sin; and were immersed and buried in the Water, to represent the Death of Sin; and then did rise up again out of the Water, to signifie their Entrance upon a new Life. And to these Customs the Apostle alludes, *Rom.* 6. 4.

Dr. Jer. Taylor, *late Lord Bishop of* Down.

In his *Ductor Dubitantium*, lib. 3. cap. 4. saith, The Custom of the ancient Church was not Sprinkling, but Immersion, in Pursuance of the sense of the word Βαπτίζοντες, both in the Commandment and Example of our blessed Saviour. And this agrees with the Mystery of the Sacrament it self; for we are buried with him in Baptism (saith the Apostle.) The old Man is buried and drowned in the Immersion *under* Water; and when the Baptized Person is lifted up from the Water, it represents the Resurrection of the New Man to Newness of Life.

The Learned Joseph Mede,

In his *Diatribe on Titus* 3. 5. saith, There was no such thing as Sprinkling used in Baptism in the Apostles time, nor many Ages after them.

Mr. Daniel Rogers.

None of old were wont to be Sprinkled, and (saith he) I confess my self unconvinced by Demonstration of Scripture for Infants Sprinkling. It ought to be the Churches Part to cleave to the Institution, which is Dipping. And he betrays the Church, whose Officer he is, to a disorder'd Error, if he cleave not to the Institution, which is to Dip. Rogers's *Treatise of the two Sacraments*, Part 1. Chap. 5.

The Famous Reformer Luther.

Luther *de Baptismo*, Tom. 1. Fol. 71. in the Latin Edition, Printed at *Wittemburgh*, saith, Baptism is a Greek Word; it may be Translated a Dipping, when we dip something in Water, that it may be covered with Water. And although it be for the most part altogether abolished, for that they do not Dip the whole Children, but only Sprinkle them with a little Water, they ought nevertheless to be wholly Dipt, and presently to be drawn out again.

And in Tom. 2. Fol. 79, concerning *Babylon*'s Captivity. The other thing (saith he) which belongs to Baptism, is the Sign, or the Sacrament, which is the Dipping it self into the Water; from whence also it hath its Name. *Nam Baptizo Græce, Mergo Latine, & Baptisma Mersio est.* For *Baptizo* in Greek, is in Latin *Mergo*, to *Dip*; and *Baptisma*, is *Dipping*. And a little after, speaking of *Rom.* 6. 4. he saith, Being moved by this Reason, I would have those that are to be Baptized, to be *wholly* Dipt *into* the Water; as the Word doth sound, and the Mystery doth signifie.

And when Complaint was made to him and other Divines at *Wittemburgh*, That a Child had been Sprinkled at *Hamburgh*, and their Advice desired upon it; he wrote to *Hamburgh* to acquaint them, That their Use of Sprinkling was an Abuse, which they ought to remove. *Ita Mersionem* Hamburgi *restitutam esse.* So Dipping was restored at *Hamburgh*. *Autor Joannes Bugenhagius Pomeranius*, in his Book Printed *Anno* 1542. He was Contemporary with, and a Successor of *Luther* at *Wittemburgh*.

The

The Learned Grotius,

On *Matth.* 3. 6. *Mersatione autem, non perfusione agi solitum hunc ritum indicat & vocis proprietas, & loca ad eum ritum delecta,* John 3. 23. Acts 8. 38. *Et alluſiones multæ Apoſtolorum quæ ad aſperſionem referri non poſſunt,* Rom. 6. 3, 4. Col. 2. 12.

Mr. John Calvin.

On *John* 3. 23. Baptiſm was performed by *John* and *Chriſt*, by dipping of the whole Body in Water.

And in his Inſtitutions, *lib. 4. cap. 15. ſect. 19.* he ſaith thus, *Cæterum mergaturne totus qui tingitur, idque ter an ſemel, an infuſa tantum aqua aſpergatur, minimum refert: ſed id pro regionum diverſitate Eccleſiis liberum eſſe debet. Quanquam & ipſum baptizandi verbum mergere ſignificat, & mergendi ritum veteri Eccleſiæ obſervatum fuiſſe conſtat.*

Here you may ſee, that although he thinks it a thing indifferent whether it be done by Dipping or Sprinkling, and that thrice or once only; and that it's left to the Churches Liberty, according to the diverſity of Countries: yet he comes in at laſt with his *Quanquam*, nowithſtanding the word *Baptiſm* ſignifies *to Dip*, and it is evident that the Rite of Dipping was obſerved by the Old Church.

The Caſe is ſo clear (as a learned Writer hath noted) that *Calvin* up and down his Works doth often confeſs, that the ancient manner of Baptiſm in the Primitive times was by Dipping the whole Body *under* Water.

Piſcator,

On *John* 3. 23. ſaith, That Baptiſm was performed by Dipping the whole Body *under* Water.

The Dutch *Tranſlators.*

Matth. 3. 1. *Joannes de Dooper*, John the Dipper. *Verſ.* 6. *Gedoopt in de Jordaen*, Dipt in Jordan. *Verſ.* 16 *Ende Jeſus gedoopt zynde opgeclommen uyt het water.* And Jeſus being Dipt, he (climbed or) came up out of the Water. *Matth.* 28. 19. *Onderwyſt alle de volckeren, deſelve dopende in den name des vaders*, &c. Inſtruct all the People, dipping the ſame in the name of the Father, &c. Mark 1. 9. *Ende wiert van Joanne gedoopt in de Jordaen. Ende terſtont als hy uyt het Water opklam*, &c. And was dipt

Cyprian, *Epiphanius*, and others. And this is *still* (saith he) the Practice both of the *Greeks* and *Russians* to this Day. And Cites, *Cassander de Baptismo*, p. 193. and yet notwithstanding this Custom, which is both so *Ancient* and so *Universal*, is now abolished by the Church of *Rome*.

And this is the reason that the *Muscovites* say that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly Baptized; because they do not use this Ancient Ceremony in their Baptism.

Also, in that *Greek Lexicon*, Published and Recommended to all, for the encrease of Knowledge (and explained in *English*) by Mr. *Joseph Caryll*, Mr. *George Cockayne*, Mr. *Ralph Vening*, Mr. *William Dell*, Mr. *Matthew Barker*, Mr. *William Adderly*, Mr. *Matthew Mead*, Mr. *Henry Jessey*. They render Βάπτω, to dip, plunge, or drown. In the passive Voice, Βάπτομαι, to be plunged, or overwhelmed. Ἐμβάπτω, to dip in, as one doth his Finger in Liquor. [*From this we may allow, that the Presbyterian Ministers do Baptize their Fingers when they dip them into the Water: but cannot be said to Baptize the Children, because they do not dip them in the Water, but sprinkle only a little Water upon their Faces.*] *Matth.* 26. 23. *John* 13. 26. *Mark* 14. 20. Βαπτίζω, to plunge, to overwhelm, to wash, to dip, *Matth.* 3. 11. *John* 1. 25. Chap. 3. 26. *John* 4. 1. 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *John* 1. 31. *Matth.* 28. 19. *John* 3. 22. *John* 4. 2. Chap. 1. 28.

Βαπτίζομαι, to be plunged, to be Baptized, or Dipt.

By a Metaphor, it's taken for Affliction, *Matth.* 20. 22. which is familiarly read in Scripture; whereby Afflictions are compared to the Gulphs and Whirl-Pools of Water, into which those are plunged, who struggle with the Miseries and Calamities of this Life. Yet they are so plunged, that they can lift up themselves again.

I might also add, what those several great Masters of the Greek Tongue, as *Scapula*, *Stephanus*, *Schrevelius*, and divers others, have said concerning the Etymology thereof. But the Learned being so well acquainted therewith, I shall only touch upon it: They confirming what I have already observed from others. They tell us in their *Lexicons*, that Βαπτίζω, *&c.* from Βάπτω, signifies *mergo*, *immergo*, *submergo*, *obruo*; *item tingo*, *quod fit immergendo*. To dip, to overwhelm, to plunge or dip in, to drown or sink in the Water, to overwhelm, to dip, or plunge; to put under, to cover clean over, *&c.* And that Ῥαντίζω, *Rantizo*, is *Aspergo*, to sprinkle: Ῥαντισμὸς, *Aspersio*, Sprinkling.

Now these two different Words, do signifie two different Actions: For he that is only sprinkled, cannot be said to be dipt, or plunged under the Water, and to come up again out of

of the Water, (when they were never in it) as those are said to do, in *Acts* 8. 38. They went both down *into* the Water, and they came up again *out* of the Water. Besides, I challenge all the Learned in the World to shew one Instance in the *New Testament*, that these Words *Rantizo*, *Rantismos*, or *Rantisma*, are ever made use of by the Spirit of God to express that Ordinance of Baptism by. For they know right well that *Bapto*, and its Derivatives are always made use of to express it by. And where they are translated into English, the one is rendred dipping, and the other Sprinkling. But if these Men will keep up a Practise contrary to Holy Scripture, and the Judgment of the most Learned *Lexicographers* and *Criticks* in the Greek Tongue, it's their own fault, and not ours.

The Assembly of Divines Annotations.

Acts 8. 38. They went both down into the Water.

They were wont to dip the *whole* Body, or go down into the Water, as here, and *Matth.* 3. 16.

And upon *Rom.* 6. 4. Buried with him by Baptism. See *Col.* 2. 12. In this Phrase the Apostle seemeth to allude to the *Ancient* Manner of Baptism; which was to dip the Parties baptized, and as it were, to bury them *under* the Water for a while, and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up; to represent the Burial of our Old Man, and our Resurrection to newness of Life.

The late Dr. *Gabriel Towerson*, in his Explication of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, Part 4. page 20, *&c.* speaks largely upon it, in Vindication of the Rite of Dipping in baptism; of which I shall recite some few Passages, and refer you to his Book for the rest.

Baptism is intended as a Sign, and that in respect of the manner of Application used; I mean the dipping, or plunging the Party baptized in it. A signification which St. *Paul* will not suffer those to forget, who have been acquainted with his Epistles, for which he quotes *Rom.* 6. 4. and *Col.* 2. 12. It was performed by the Ceremony of Immersion, that the Person Immersed, might by that Ceremony (which was no obscure Image of a Sepulture) be minded of the precedent Death, as in like manner by his coming again out of the Water, of his rising from that Death to Life, after the Example of the Institutor thereof.

Cyprian, *Epiphanius*, and others. And this is *still* (saith he) the Practice both of the *Greeks* and *Russians* to this Day. And Cites, *Cassander de Baptismo*, p. 193. and yet notwithstanding this Custom, which is both so *Ancient* and so *Universal*, is now abolished by the Church of *Rome*.

And this is the reason that the *Muscovites* say that the *Latines* are not rightly and duly Baptized; because they do not use this Ancient Ceremony in their Baptism.

Also, in that *Greek Lexicon*, Published and Recommended to all, for the encrease of Knowledge (and explained in *English*) by Mr. *Joseph Caryll*, Mr. *George Cockayne*, Mr. *Ralph Vening*, Mr. *William Dell*, Mr. *Matthew Barker*, Mr. *William Adderly*, Mr. *Matthew Mead*, Mr. *Henry Jessey*. They render Βάπτω, to dip, plunge, or drown. In the passive Voice, Βάπτομαι, to be plunged, or overwhelmed. Ἐμβάπτω, to dip in, as one doth his Finger in Liquor. [*From this we may allow, that the Presbyterian Ministers do Baptize their Fingers when they dip them into the Water: but cannot be said to Baptize the Children, because they do not dip them in the Water, but sprinkle only a little Water upon their Faces.*] *Matth.* 26. 23. *John* 13. 26. *Mark* 14. 20. Βαπτίζω, to plunge, to overwhelm, to wash, to dip, *Matth.* 3. 11. *John* 1. 25. Chap. 3. 26. *John* 4. 1. 1 *Cor.* 1. 17. *John* 1. 31. *Matth.* 28. 19. *John* 3. 22. *John* 4. 2. Chap. 1. 28.

Βαπτίζομαι, to be plunged, to be Baptized, or Dipt.

By a Metaphor, it's taken for Affliction, *Matth.* 20. 22. which is familiarly read in Scripture; whereby Afflictions are compared to the Gulphs and Whirl-Pools of Water, into which those are plunged, who struggle with the Miseries and Calamities of this Life. Yet they are so plunged, that they can lift up themselves again.

I might also add, what those several great Masters of the Greek Tongue, as *Scapula*, *Stephanus*, *Schrevelius*, and divers others, have said concerning the Etymology thereof. But the Learned being so well acquainted therewith, I shall only touch upon it: They confirming what I have already observed from others. They tell us in their *Lexicons*, that Βαπτίζω, *&c.* from Βάπτω, signifies *mergo*, *immergo*, *submergo*, *obruo*; *item tingo*, *quod fit immergendo*. To dip, to overwhelm, to plunge or dip in, to drown or sink in the Water, to overwhelm, to dip, or plunge; to put under, to cover clean over, *&c.* And that Ῥαντίζω, *Rantizo*, is *Aspergo*, to sprinkle: Ῥαντισμὸς, *Aspersio*, Sprinkling.

Now these two different Words, do signifie two different Actions: For he that is only sprinkled, cannot be said to be dipt, or plunged under the Water, and to come up again out of

of the Water, (when they were never in it) as those are said to do, in *Acts* 8. 38. They went both down *into* the Water, and they came up again *out* of the Water. Besides, I challenge all the Learned in the World to shew one Instance in the *New Testament*, that these Words *Rantizo*, *Rantismos*, or *Rantisma*, are ever made use of by the Spirit of God, to express that Ordinance of Baptism by. For they know right well that *Bapto*, and its Derivatives are always made use of to express it by. And where they are translated into English, the one is rendred dipping, and the other Sprinkling. But if these Men will keep up a Practise contrary to Holy Scripture, and the Judgment of the most Learned *Lexicographers* and *Criticks* in the Greek Tongue, it's their own fault, and not ours.

The Assembly of Divines Annotations.

Acts 8. 38. They went both down into the Water.

They were wont to dip the *whole* Body, or go down into the Water, as here, and *Matth.* 3. 16.

And upon *Rom.* 6. 4. Buried with him by Baptism. See *Col.* 2. 12. In this Phrase the Apostle seemeth to allude to the *Ancient* Manner of Baptism; which was to dip the Parties baptized, and as it were, to bury them *under* the Water for a while, and then to draw them out of it, and lift them up; to represent the Burial of our Old Man, and our Resurrection to newness of Life.

The late Dr. *Gabriel Towerson*, in his Explication of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, Part 4. page 20, *&c.* speaks largely upon it, in Vindication of the Rite of Dipping in baptism; of which I shall recite some few Passages, and refer you to his Book for the rest.

Baptism is intended as a Sign, and that in respect of the manner of Application used; I mean the dipping, or plunging the Party baptized in it. A signification which St. *Paul* will not suffer those to forget, who have been acquainted with his Epistles, for which he quotes *Rom.* 6. 4. and *Col.* 2. 12. It was performed by the Ceremony of Immersion, that the Person Immersed, might by that Ceremony (which was no obscure Image of a Sepulture) be minded of the precedent Death, as in like manner by his coming again out of the Water, of his rising from that Death to Life, after the Example of the Institutor thereof.

Then he puts this Queſtion, Whether it ought to be performed by an Immerſion, or an Aſperſion, *&c?*

His Anſwer is, It may be a more material Queſtion than is commonly deemed by us, who have been accuſtomed to baptize by a bare Effuſion and Sprinkling of Water upon the Party.

For things which depend for their force on the meer Will and Pleaſure of him who Inſtituted them, there ought (no doubt) great regard to be had to the Commands of him that did ſo; as without which there is no reaſon we ſhould receive the benefit of that Ceremony to which he has been pleaſed to annex it.

Now what the Command of Chriſt was in this particular, cannot be well doubted of by thoſe who ſhall conſider: Firſt, The Words of Chriſt, *Matth.* 28. 19. concerning it, and the Practice of thoſe Times, whether in the Baptiſm of *John* or our Saviour; for the Words of Chriſt are, *That they ſhould baptize or dip thoſe whom they made Diſciples to him*; for (ſo no doubt) the word Βαπτίζοντες, *Baptizontes*, properly ſignifies: Though if there could be any doubt concerning the ſignification of the words themſelves, yet would that doubt be removed by conſidering the Practice of thoſe Times. For ſuch as was the Practice of thoſe Times in baptizing ſuch in reaſon we are to think our Saviour's Command to have been concerning it, *&c.* there being not otherwiſe any means either for thoſe, or future Times to diſcover his intention concerning it.

What the Practice of thoſe Times were, will need no other proof, than the reſorting to Rivers and other ſuch Receptacles of Water for the Performance of that Ceremony, as that becauſe there was *much* Water there, *Matth.* 3. 5. *John* 3. 23. And the Scripture expreſly affirming concerning the baptiſm of the Eunuch, *Acts* 8. 38. That *Philip* and the Eunuch went both down into a certain Water (which they met with in their Journey) in order to the baptizing of the latter.

For what need would there have been of the Baptiſts reſorting to great Confluxes of Water; or of *Philip*'s and the Eunuch's going down *into* this, were it not that the Baptiſm both of the one and the other, were to be performed by an Immerſion, a very little Water (as we know it doth with us) ſufficing for an Effuſion or Sprinkling.

The ſame is to be ſaid yet more, upon the account of our conforming to the Death and Reſurrection of Chriſt, which we learn from St. *Paul* to be the deſign of Baptiſm to ſignifie; for though that might, and was well enough repreſented by the baptized Perſons being buried in Baptiſm, and their riſing

out

out of it; yet can it not be said to be so, or, at least but very imperfectly, by the bare pouring out, or sprinkling the baptismal Water on him.

But therefore, as there is so much the more Reason to represent the Rite of Immersion as the *Only* Legitimate Rite of Baptism, because the *Only One* that can answer the ends of its Institution, and those things that were to be signified by it; so especially, if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of great force) the general Practice of the Primitive Church was agreeable thereto, and the Greek Church to this very day: for who can think that either the one, or the other, would have been so tenacious of so troublesom a Rite, were it not that they were well assured (as they of the Primitive Church might very well be) of its being the *Only* Instituted and Legitimate One. I cannot but think the forementioned Arguments to be so far of force, as to evince the necessity thereof, *&c.* For what benefit can Men ordinarily expect from that which depends for its force upon the Will of him that instituted it; where there is no such compliance in the least with it, and the Command of the Institutor, as may answer those ends for which he applied it.

Dr. Barlow, *late Bishop of* Lincoln, *in his Letter to Mr.* John Tombes, *Printed in his Life-time and owned by him.*

He saith thus; I believe and know, that there is neither Precept nor Practice in the Scripture for Pædo-baptism; nor any just Evidence for it, for about two hundred Years after Christ. Sure I am, that in the Primitive Times they were to be *Catechumeni*, and then *Illuminati*, or *Baptizati*: And this not only Children of Pagans, or Pagans Converted; but Children of Christian Parents. *Nazianzen*, though a Bishop's Son, being not baptized till he was about Thirty Years of Age, as appears in his Life. And the like is evident in some others.

I have seen what my Learned and Worthy Friend Dr. *Hammond*, Mr. *Baxter*, and others, say in defence of it; and I confess I wonder not a little, that Men of such Parts should say so much to so little purpose: for I have not seen any thing like an Argument for it.

I shall add no more, but my hearty Wishes, that as God was pleased to make the Hearing of the Dispute of such use to several Persons, that they were fully convinced (by the Grace of God towards them) of the Truth of the Doctrine of Holy Baptism, and did in few days after submit themselves

ſelves to be dipt in Water upon Profeſſion of their Faith according to the Commiſſion of our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, That it may alſo be of the like uſe to many others, in the Reading of it; that ſo there may be added to the Church daily, ſuch as ſhall be Saved. And then my Deſign will be anſwered in its Publication; and I ſhall count it a ſufficient Reward for all my Pains and Labour therein.

FINIS.

Some BRIEF

Animadversions

UPON

Mr. *ALLEN*'s ESSAY,

To Prove

The Common Practice of Singing in Rhime, with conjoined Voices, as it is now used in their Congregation, to be a Christian Duty:

WHEREIN

His Arguments are Examined and Refuted.

By *William Russel*, Doctor in Physick, of the famous University of *Cambridge*.

זֶה הוּא בְנִי וְדוֹדִי אֲשֶׁר בּוֹ רָצִיתִי אוֹתוֹ שִׁמְעוּ׃

Hic est meus charissimus Filius, qui mihi acceptus est, hunc audite, Mat. 17. 5.

Nec enim sumus ut multi, qui divinam doctrinam cauponantur: — For we are not as many, which corrupt the Word of God, 2 Cor. 2. 17. which mix their own Inventions with it.

LONDON, Printed for the Author, 1696.

And having communicated to many of you, when lately assembled in this City of London, *my Design in this Publication; as also to divers worthy Brethren who reside therein: And meeting with a sufficient Encouragement and Approbation thereto, as a thing tending to the Glory of God, the Preservation of the Churches from Error, and the reducing such that have gone astray, and restoring them to that Peace and Union they enjoyed, before the time they were disturbed and divided by some late Troublers of the Churches, who have introduced this new Humane Invention of Singing* David's Psalms *in Rhime and Metre, with conjoined Voices,* &c. *as a Church-Ordinance, amongst us, for which there is neither Precept nor Precedent in all the New Testament; I have therefore proceeded in the Publication thereof, and in this Dedication to you.*

Honoured and Beloved Brethren,

You will find in this Treatise several things (which to me seem very considerable) that I have animadverted upon. As,

1. *Their Justifying several Additions to the Word of God, upon which much of the Controversie depends; as the Word* Sung, *&c. which is added in divers places in our late English Translation, and is not to be found in the Original Greek Text.*

2. *Their*

2. *Their Detracting from the Word of God, in leaving out several words that are in the Original Hebrew Text; as in* Psalm 148 1. *they have left out these words,* הַלְלוּ אֶת־יְהוָה Halelu & Jehovah, *which contains seven Syllables, and fifteen Letters; and is in English,* Praise ye the Lord. *And this is done on purpose to deceive their unlearned Reader, as you will see by what I have observed at large upon the place.*

But I am told by some, it hath been said in their defence, That there is a stroke — betwixt the other words, to signifie this omission.

I am sorry that any Man of Understanding should frame such an Excuse, either for Himself or Friend: For it is not only manifest to all that understand Hebrew, *that there are two such strokes — in the Original Text, in that very line; but also to every Reader, that Mr.* Allen *hath put down two strokes —— also in the same line, in his Book: And twice more, in the second Verse, there is the same stroke — put in by him: And twice more in* Psal. 8. 4. *although he hath not left out any one word in those other places which are in the Original Text. And in case I should bestow the Pains and Trouble to examine it, I doubt not to produce Five hundred places in the Book of* Psalms, *in Hebrew, and some Thousands in the* Old Testament, *where the same stroke is used to unite words to-*

gether. Makkaph *is the name by which this* (—) *stroke is called by the Hebricians, and is put to join two, and sometimes three words together, as appears by the following Example:*

Gnal-phalgei-majim, עַל־פַּלְגֵי־מָיִם, *see* Hanserd Knollis, Rud. Heb. Gram. pag. 8. *and* Ludov. de Dieu, Gram. Hebr. *&c. but never to signifie words omitted, as they pretend. It's often used in English words, in the same sence, as,* Priest-hood, Man-hood, Birth-right, Four-footed Beasts, Easter-day, Whit-Sunday, Common-Prayer, *and many other words wherein it's used, not to signifie any thing left out, but to unite them together. But however, this is an acknowledgment of their leaving out those words I have charged them with, out of the Original Text: And the reason is obvious, because it should seem to be metre, to make good his Assertion, although it was otherwise in the Word of God. But who gave them Authority to deal thus deceitfully with the Divine Oracles? And indeed, this Excuse serves only to aggravate their Offence.*

I do not therefore any longer wonder to find them sometimes make so bold; as some of them do with humane Authors, to mis-represent them, when they dare to deal thus by the holy Scripture.

There are divers Abuses of that kind took

notice

notice of by those Elders who examined the Writings of Mr. Keach, *and his learned Hand, about Singing, who have charged the same upon them in print, to which I refer the Reader.*

There is one Instance I shall observe in this place; and the rather, because Mr. Allen *refers us to that learned Hand, about the word* ὑμνῶ, *and calls him* a Learned Minister of Christ, *&c. where, speaking about the signification of* ὑμνήσαντες, hymnesantes, *in* Mat. 26. 30. *he saith, The following words not being well render'd by Mr.* Tymme, *I shall set down, they are these,* Græcum verbum laudem quidem; maxime quæ Deo debetur, includit; non autem necessario evincit; quod Cecinerint. *The Greek word indeed includes* Praise, *chiefly that which is due to God; but it doth not necessarily evince that they sung. But I pray, how doth this learned Minister (who is one of Mr.* Allen's *five Champions) render it?*

The Greek word indeed (*saith he*) includes *Praise,* chiefly that which is due to God; but undoubtedly it doth evince that they Sung. *From such Translators,* Libera nos Domine. *What an Abuse was this upon his English Reader? For they could not examine the matter themselves, (although every one that understands Latin, might see the fallacy at the first view.) But they knew that*

Book was most likely to fall into the hands of more that did not understand it, than of those that did, and of such who would take it upon trust from so learned a Hand.

These are some of those Stratagems where-with they endeavour to beguile ignorant and unstable Souls; and so long as they shall continue the Use of such Practices, they must expect to hear of them, that sincere Souls may avoid being taken in the snare.

3. *I have also took notice what small regard they have hitherto taken of some of the most material Passages that have been alledged against this their Practice of Singing in Rhime*, &c. *by Mr.* Isaac Marlow, *Mr.* Kiffen, *Mr.* Steed, *Mr.* Barrett, *Mr.* Man, *and the Author of the late Queries; and of their presenting the World in Print with the same Arguments which had been sufficiently confuted, and that some years before* Mr. Allen *and these five Gentlemen usher'd his Book into the World. This is indeed the way to enrich the Printer, but not to put an end to the Controversie, nor satisfie the Consciences of sincere Christians by the Word of God. It is very troublesom to contend with such that will not be perswaded to cease practising that which hath no Foundation in the Holy Scriptures, but is built purely upon humane Authority, when it is made out so to be with the greatest clearness of evidence that*

men

men can define. I see it's a great mischief, even to the best of men, publickly to defend an Error, for they lie under a temptation to continue that Opposition, for Reputation-sake: And therefore how cautious had all Christians need to be, how they espouse any one thing without undoubted Authority.

The Philosophers of our Age are far more cautious of being deceived in the knowledge of Natural things, than our Divines are about Spiritual; for they will not admit of any one thing to be true, upon the highest Probability imaginable, unless there can be given a Demonstration of it, suitable to the nature of that Science: And therefore Des Cartes *lays this down as a Rule to direct them, That nothing be admitted for truth, but what they can have a clear and distinct knowledge of; and therefore saith in his Book,* Principiorum Philosophiæ, *par.* 1. *pag.* 11. Certum autem est, nihil nos unquam falsum pro vero admissuros, si tantum iis assensum præbeamus, quæ clarè & distincte percipiemus.

Now, in Divinity we have as certain a Rule to walk by, both in the Credenda *and* Agenda, *and a more certain than they can have in Natural Philosophy, and yet men Err more about it*; Credenda esse omnia quæ à Deo revelata sunt, quamvis captum nostrum excedant.

Agenda

Agenda esse omnia quæ à Christo precepta sunt. *We are to believe all things which we know to be divinely revealed, as they are so revealed, altho' the* Modus Operandi *be unknown to us. As in the Creation of the World, and the Incarnation of the Son of God,* &c. *we are bound to believe these things to be true, because revealed, altho' we cannot form any Idea in our minds how either the one or the other was effected, or else you must deny all the Fundamental Truths of Religion, even God himself.*

As to the Agenda, *the things to be performed in Divine Worship, we have a most certain Rule to direct us from God himself, for he hath commanded us to hear his Son, the Lord Jesus, in all things relating thereunto: He hath appointed him (as Mediator) to be the Priest, Prophet, and King, in and over his Church, to teach and govern them by his Laws; he is that one Law-giver, who is able to save and to destroy.*

We have therefore nothing to do about instituted Worship, but to search into the Scriptures of the New-Testament, to find what Christ hath commanded, and to obey him in it.

And if any one proposes any thing to us about Divine instituted Worship that is not there written, to reject it.

And

And therefore we refuse to practise singing, as our Brethren do, because there is no Precept nor Precedent for it, from our only Lawgiver, the Lord Jesus. And we have great reason so to do, for it is written, The Prophet that shall presume to speak a word in my Name, which I have not commanded him to speak, even that Prophet shall dy, Deut. 18. 20. *much more if we shall presume to practise a device of our own, or others, as a Church-Ordinance, which our Lawgiver hath not commanded us, (as is the case of our Brethren about their mode of singing) and yet have the confidence to say it is so commanded; it's to belye the Son of God, and to procure that dreadful Curse threatned,* Rev. 22. 18, 19.

4. *I have Animadverted upon their pretence of singing, as they practise it, to be a moral duty, and have enervated all the Evidence they have given for it, and I hope they will not insist upon that any more.*

But I cannot pass by one thing, which is worthy Observation, that some of those five ministers who have affixed their Names to Mr. Allen's *Book, by way of approbation, should yet omit to practise it in their own Congregation: Especially when they tell us in that Book it is a moral Duty, and as such good in it's self, good in its own nature, antecedently*

dently to God's commanding it in his Word. Originally written in the Heart of man by nature, and may in a great measure be discerned without any special Revelation, and therefore of an universal and immutable Obligation. I desire to know of them, who gave them this power to dispence with Precepts simply moral?

I shall argue upon it, and so pass it.

Whatsoever is a Duty simply moral, may be proved so to be without Scripture.

But their practice of singing in Rhime by a set form, cannot be proved a duty without Scripture.

Ergo, *It is not a duty simply moral.*

That which cannot be proved to be a duty simply moral by the light of Nature, nor a positive duty by the light of Holy Scripture, is no duty at all.

But singing in Rhime, as our Brethren practice it, cannot be proved to be a duty simply moral by the light of Nature, nor a positive duty by the light of Holy Scripture.

Ergo, *It is no duty at all.*

And I hope God will help them in time to see their Error herein, and reform.

But in the mean time I cannot but grieve to think how they have corrupted the minds of some of our young Men with this Notion of theirs about singing; And more particularly that hopeful young Branch, Mr. Thomas

mas Harrison, *who is prevailed upon by them to run retrograde to all that Pious and Learned Instruction given by his Reverend Father upon this Occasion, an account of which you have in Mr.* Robert Steed's *Epistle against the common and popular way of singing*, pag. 2, 3. *as follows,*

Speaking to his Congregation, he saith, That you might (by the Grace of God) be confirmed in your abstaining from that humane invented way of common singing, &c. *what I have preached to you, was that which I was instructed in by the Grace of God, partly by searching the Scriptures, and partly by the information I had in the days of my youth, by converse with those worthies who were then as burning and shining lights in those Congregations, but are now for the most part fallen asleep. And among the rest, (that I may give Honour unto whom Honour is due) I shall mention one who was well known to many of you, which was Mr.* Harrison, (*of blessed Memory*) *the late Pious, Prudent, Laborious, Learned, Faithful Pastor of the Church, formerly meeting at* Petty France, *he once declaring in my hearing, how he was for several years in his Judgment and Affection greatly addicted to, and much in the practice of the common way of singing, till such time as it pleased the Lord once greatly to awaken him,*

him, first in the very midst of his singing, (Note, *Mr.* Harrison *had been a Parish-Minister before he was a Baptist*) *and after more maturely to ponder his path, whereby through an impartial search of the Scriptures he was perswaded that this common way of singing was to be avoided, as Will-worship, as much as Common-Prayer, or Infant sprinkling, which Scripture ground he then declared; whereby he was greatly Instrumental in the hand of the Lord to help and settle me in that matter. This being considered, it did not bespeak that Respect and Honour he ought to have had to his Father's Memory, when he set his Hand to Mr.* Allen's *Book, directly opposite to his Pious and Learned Sentiments, till he had been able to answer (with all modesty) the Grounds of his Fathers Opinion to the contrary, who declared it to be Will-worship, as much as Common-Prayer and Infant-sprinkling. But I rather blame those who were the Instruments to draw him into such an indiscreet Action than himself; for I have more honourable thoughts of him than is proper for me to express in this place.*

5. *They tell us in that Pamphlet with seventeen Names to it, whereof two of these who have set their hands to Mr.* Allen's *Book are of that Number. viz. Mr.* Joseph Maisters *and Mr.* William Collins,

that

that there is no other way prescribed for singing under the Gospel, than what was under the Law, and therefore they assert we ought to sing, as they sung under the Law: This was spoken further to in those Queries presented lately to the singers, but they give it the go-by, as they do many other things; altho' it be sufficiently proved by the Queriſt, that their practice is contrary in many respects to that under the Law, particularly as it referr'd to Temple-worship, and now in Mr. Allen's *Book the same men are pleased to tell us, there is no particular prescription for their singing in Rhime in the New-Testament: But according to that general Rule, do all things decently and in order, the major part of* Mr. Allen's *Congregation have power to impose it upon the rest, they judging it most for Edification.*

Now if it were a duty simply moral, and taught by the dictates of the Light of Nature, as they affirm, they could never want Direction how to perform it, because they would then always carry their guide about them, where-ever they went, but now they have it to seek from the Law, and say they have no other Direction for it. And anon from the major vote of Mr. Allen's *Congregation, in what manner, and by what musical Tunes they shall think fit to perform it by, this seems to be*

very

very contrary to their other assertion, that it is a moral Duty, but we can no ways help their being self-condemned.

There are many other things I had a purpose to have spoken to in this Epistle, but the limits allotted me will not permit it.

And I doubt not but I shall have reflections from them for what I have already done, having met with that before for my Introduction to the Queries, altho' I did it with all the modesty and caution the nature of the subject would admit, especially when I consider their unkindness to their old Servant who wrote the Queries; for they have turned him out of his House, and took away all his Sallary from him, notwithstanding he was one of their own members, and had served them faithfully even to old age, and is yet in full communion with them. However, I will not render evil for evil, but endeavour in meekness to instruct those that oppose themselves, altho' they should trample it under their feet, and turn again and rent me: Hoping that God for Christ's sake (whose cause I am engaged in) will assist me with his spirit to bear it with Faith and Patience.

I shall now recommend these weak endeavours to the Blessing of God, and the serious consideration of you my Brethren; hoing it may be of use to establish the minds

of

of some, and reduce others who have erred from the Truth.

And wherein I have been deficient, I hope God will stir up the Spirits of some others, who have more Leisure, greater Learning, and better Parts, to give a more full Answer to Mr. Allen's *Essay, and to set the Truth we contend for in a clearer light, that we may all call upon the Name of the Lord, and serve him with one consent, which is the earnest desire, and hearty prayer, of your unworthy Brother in the Lord Jesus;*

From my House in *Barbican, July,* 11. *1696.*

William Russel.

I have only this Request to Mr. *Allen*, and the other Brethren embarqu'd with him in this Controversie, that if they shall write again, they would please to lay down the true state of the Question, before they enter upon the Controversie, for an Omission of this in Mr. *Allen*'s Essay did necessitate me to go thro' his Book, from the beginning even to the end thereof, before I could collect all the parts of that one proposition he intended to prove. And if

they shall not be so happy as to find out a more proper Question, I desire their Answer to this that follows, being well assured if they can prove it in the affirmative, it will not only be full satisfaction to my self, but to all others that dissent from them.

The Question is,

Whether Jesus Christ as Mediator of the New-Covenant, hath commanded his Churches under the Gospel in all their Assemblies, to sing the Psalms of David, *as translated into Metre and Musical Rhime, with Tunable and Conjoined Voices of all the People together, as a Church-Ordinance, or any other Songs or Hymns that are so composed, to be sung in Rhime, by a prelimited and set form of Words?*

Some

Some BRIEF

Animadversions

UPON

Mr. *ALLEN*'s ESSAY, &c.

AFTER I had written several Pages in Answer to Mr. *Allen*'s Book, I took a view of that excellent Treatise written by that ancient Servant of Christ, Mr. *William Kiffen*, and several other Ministers, entituled, *A Serious Answer to a late Book, styled,* [*A Reply to Mr.* Robert Steed's *Epistle concerning Singing,*] printed *Anno* 1692. wherein I find so full and solid an Answer to those pretended Authorities produced by Mr. *Allen*, for their Practice of Singing in Rhime, there is little more remains to be spoken upon that Subject; and therefore I do heartily recommend it to the perusal of all such who desire Satisfaction therein.

And indeed, it begat in me no small Wonder, to see Mr. *Allen*'s Book emitted into the World four years after, and make no further advance: It seemed to me to be only *actum agere*, to do that which had been done before, and fully confuted by them and Mr. *Marlow*.

So that in case he had not exercised his Talent, in contradicting some things mentioned in an Introduction to some *Queries* lately presented to the Consideration of the Singers, I had resolved to have past it by in silence; but now I find my self obliged to make some few *Animadversions* upon it, leaving the Body of his Book to be answered by some other Hand.

The first thing he notes in that Introduction, is, That the Author thereof saith, 'They have 'innovated a Form of Worship never practised '(as he finds in all History) by any of our Bre'thren before us, nor indeed in the World by 'any other, till about the time of *Beza* and '*Calvin*, in the last Century.

And that is, to sing in Rhime by a set Form, and that by all the People together, whether Saints or Sinners, Members or no Members, whether they are Young or Old, understand or not understand what is sung.

He divides this into Two Parts:

1. He tells us, *That several of the Baptized Churches have been divers years in the practice of it.*

I suppose he means Mr. *Keach*'s, and some few others; which is no Contradiction to what I said, for it's them I am speaking of.

And pray let him who is become their Advocate, tell me of any of our Brethren of the Baptized Churches, who did practice Singing as they now do, before this Age. He hath not done it yet, nor I suppose ever will.

As for his Instance of one Mr. *Skinner*, whom he brings in, saying, 'That he, and the Church 'under his care, were none of those that refused '*singing of Psalms to the Honour of God*, which

was

was publiſhed above forty years ago in a Preface to a Book againſt *Infant-Baptiſm*; I anſwer,

1*ſt*. Mr. *Allen* doth not tell us this Man was a *Baptiſt*: For I have known many in my time who have oppoſed *Infant-Baptiſm*, and never ſubmitted to it themſelves upon Profeſſion of Faith; and I have not his Book to inform me. But ſuppoſe he were, what is Forty, to almoſt Seventeen hundred Years? A mighty Inſtance of Antiquity!

But 2*dly*. There being nothing in thoſe words (as cited by Mr. *Allen*) to prove that his Church were in the practice of ſinging *David*'s, or any other Pſalms, as tranſlated into Engliſh Rhime, it makes nothing to his purpoſe. But I perceive a ſinking Man is willing to lay hold of the leaſt Twig for his Support, although it fail him in the iſſue.

But 2*dly*. He ſaith, *Yea, we are further told, not only that this Practice is New among us; but alſo, that it was never uſed in the World by any other, till about the time of* Beza *and* Calvin, *in the laſt Century.*

The Teſtimony that is alledged for this he cannot deny; yea, himſelf ſays enough to evince the truth of it, to any that did not believe it before: But however, he is in a grand Paſſion, ſaying, *That R.* Watſon, *D. D. though he be cited with the ſplendid Title of* Reverend, *he is a very ſcurrilous Author*; and quarrels mightily with him, for ſome Difference that happen'd long ago betwixt him and Dr. *Coſin*, about another Controverſie; which is nothing at all to this Matter about Singing, and ſerves only to raiſe a Duſt to blind the Eyes of his unwary Reader.

As for his passionate and unwary Expressions against a Doctor in Divinity, and of the Church of *England*, and (I suppose) yet living, I shall take no further notice of, but leave it to the Doctor himself to chastise him for it, and to demand Satisfaction for not allowing him the Title of *Reverend*, and shall return to the Matter in hand.

The Reverend Dr. *Watson* saith, in his Book *against Singing in Rhime*, printed at *London*, *Anno* 1684. *pag.* 19. 'The Original of this De-'vice (*viz.* of turning the Psalms of *David* into 'Rhime and Metre) was not in *England*, but first 'taken up by one *Clement Marot*, a Groom of the 'Bed-Chamber to the *French* King *Francis* I. and having told us how he made Songs for the King to sing, he adds, *pag.* 20. 'That he was 'prevailed with by *Fr. Vetablus* to relinquish his 'trifling Doggrel, and to turn *David*'s *Psalms* 'into French Metre; That he did the first thirty, 'and the King sung them, as he had done his for-'mer Ballads. He further saith, That *Beza* and '*Calvin* did afterwards encourage him (when at '*Geneva*) to turn more of them into Rhime, and 'after that brought them into use in their Assem-'blies. Now this is the Matter of Fact about the Original of this Device, as reported by our Au-thor, and it is either true or false.

Doth Mr. *Allen* deny this to be true? No; he is so far from that, that his Modesty will not permit him, or his Reading not furnish him with any Instance of a higher Original than the last Cen-tury; and therefore is so kind to furnish us with Two corroborating Testimonies besides, to prove the truth of our Assertion, which are as follows:

1. Saith

1. Saith he, *We are informed by Dr.* Burnet, *an Historian whose Credit none I suppose will question.*

You are unhappy in your Guess; for I should much question a Report that had only his single Authority to support it: For I have not forgot what occasion'd the Parliament to order a Book of his (which had a grand Error in it, in point of History) to be burnt by the common Hangman; which was accordingly executed, in the presence of too many Witnesses to be denied.

But what is it this so much admired Doctor of 'his saith? 'That the *Psalms* being translated 'into Verse, were much sung by all that loved the 'Reformation; and that the Affections of Men 'to the Work of Reformation were every where 'measured by their Singing or not Singing these 'Psalms.

A blessed Standard to measure Mens Religion by, when the most Profane (if instructed therein) may sing in musical Notes, with tunable Voices, better than the most Solid and Sincere Christian!

And that we may be sure to know that his Historian carries it no higher than the beginning of the Reformation, he further adds his other unquestionable Instance. For,

2*dly.* Mr. *Allen* tells us, Mr. *Quick* saith, *That the* Psalms *being translated into French Metre at the beginning of the Reformation, were sung by all sorts and degrees of Men*, &c.

Thus you see, for all his mighty bluster against Dr. *Watson*, yet he hath fully proved his Testimony to be true, by a Bishop of the Church of *England*, and a learned Minister of a Presbyterian Congregation; for which I thank him.

But the man seems to be sorry for this Ingenuity, in a Page or two after; for he tells us of some *Egyptians*, about the second or third Age, who spent part of their time in composing Songs and Hymns to the Praise of God, of all sorts of Metre, and Musical Verse, which they writ in grave and solemn Rhimes, ῥυθμοῖς, *Numbers*.

Now how shall we know the truth of this? Why, he sends us to *Eusebius*, and then to *Egypt*; and when we come there, to search the Egyptian Records for Thirteen or Fourteen Hundred Years past. And what is all this for? Why, he tells us, *That we may know that the time of* Beza *and* Calvin, *in the last Age, is not the most ancient date of Singing in Metre and Rhime, as is pretended.* And this is the only Instance he gives.

Hath the man forgot already what he was talking of? Was it not the Translation of the *Psalms of David* in Metre, and common Rhime? And did not himself grant, nay, prove, that this was done at the beginning of the Reformation, as Dr. *Watson* had said? and was then brought into common use, even more common than the *Common-Prayer*, if Mr. *Quick* say true, as he is quoted by Mr. *Allen?* And shall he now give us an Instance of what some private Christians might do to make themselves Pastime with, or to make others merry? Surely his Business had been to have proved, that the *Psalms of David* had been translated into Rhime in some vulgar Language, and sung by some Church of Christ, as they now practice it, after the *Geneva* fashion, whom they Ape and imitate, as their beloved Founders.

But

But not one word of this. For,

1. The *Psalms of David* are not so much as mention'd; but instead thereof, Songs of their own making.

2. There is not the least syllable of their being translated into Rhime; which was the only thing he should here have proved, if he had known how: For that was the case of *Clement Marot*, in the days of *Beza* and *Calvin*: He translated them first into *French* Metre; and I still say, they were never (as I find) translated into Metre in any Language before. If he knows they were, let him give his Instance, or forbear fooling thus with his new Mode of Ballad-singing, for it is no better.

3. Nor yet is there the least mention made of bringing those Songs, after they had writ them, into their Assemblies, and reading them line by line, and all the People making a noise like madmen, in singing after them. So that this Instance may be discarded, as impertinent to what he brought it for, it not being *ad Rem*, but a faint Flourish only, suitable to that weak and unscriptural Cause he hath unadvisedly undertaken.

But suppose he could have pickt out any one Instance out of *Eusebius*, in the second or third Century, that some one Church had so sung as they do, (which it's plain he cannot; for we had heard of it before now from some of the Singsters who have written about Singing, in case there had been any) yet (I hope) this is no Rule for us to walk by; for he may find Instances within that space of time, of *Infant-Baptism*, and other corrupt Practices, which we are not to follow as our Example.

For

For we are not to go to Fathers and Councils for our Direction, but to Christ and his Apostles, who are the only infallible Guides about all the Parts of instituted Worship now under the Gospel; and if any one (although he were an Angel from Heaven) speak not according to their words, we are not to receive, but to reject his Testimony.

And I perceive Mr. *Allen* doubts of his Abilities to prove from the written Word of God, that their mode of Singing is a part of the revealed and instituted Will of Christ in these Gospel-times; because he leads us to that imperfect Guide, the Light of corrupted, depraved Nature, from thence to be instructed into their way of Singing, it being (as he conceives) a Moral Duty.

But this hath been sufficiently confuted by others, and I shall have occasion to speak more particularly to it in another place: However, I must say this of it at present, It is certainly the most insipid way of Reasoning, and the weakest Subterfuge that ever Men of Parts had recourse to, that when they are not able to shew that their Practice is any part of instituted Worship under the Gospel, they should send us to that blind Guide of corrupt Nature.

It is as if you should tell us, It is true indeed, that our way of Singing, by a prelimited Form of Words, with conjoined Voices of all the People together, in Musical Rhimes, and Tunable Notes, was never commanded by Christ, taught by his Apostles, or practised by the Primitive Churches. But if you will hearken to the Light within, and mind what the Dictates of a corrupt Humane Understanding will teach you, then you shall be better

better informed than they can do it; for that saith, *it is a Moral Duty, and therefore the Duty of all Men, and consequently of every Christian.* See Mr. *Allen*'s *Essay*, p. 14.

I shall now mind him of what follows in the Introduction, after the Account of *Clement Marot*'s translating the *Psalms* into French Metre and Rhime.

We may infer from thence, as we usually do upon another Subject, 'That seeing our Adversaries cannot prove from Scripture, or any authentick History, that any Infant was Baptized 'in the two first Centuries, it was because the 'same was not commanded by Christ, nor taught 'by his Apostles: And surely the case will hold 'good here also, seeing that Fifteen hundred 'Years were gone and past since our Saviour's 'time, and no Instance to be given of any Church 'of Christ that ever sung in Rhime.

This I thought had been of moment for him to have answered; but he passes it by, as if no such thing had been written.

I shall therefore offer some Arguments to prove the Validity of this Assertion; and I demand of our Singers a positive Answer to each of them, if they shall think fit to make a Reply.

If it doth not appear from Scripture, or any authentick History, that the Psalms of David *were translated into Rhime and Metre, until the Sixteenth Century after the Birth of Christ,*

Then it was impossible that any Church of Christ could so sing them as our Brethren now do:

But it doth not appear from Scripture, or any authentick History, that the Psalms of David *were translated*

translated into Rhime and Metre, until the Sixteenth Century after the Birth of Christ: Ergo, *It was impossible that any Church of Christ could so sing them as our Brethren now do.*

The *major* is undeniable. The *minor* I thus prove:

If it be so recorded, that they were translated into Rhime and Metre before that time, you or some other are able to shew it:

But neither you nor any other are able to shew it: Ergo, *It is not so recorded.*

Now as the *major* of this Argument cannot be denied, so the *minor* will also stand good till you give an Instance where it is so recorded, the Argument being a universal Negative: And therefore I shall thus infer upon you,

If Singing in Rhime and Metre was never practised by any Church of Christ until the Sixteenth Century, it was because the Lord Jesus had not commanded it so to be:

But it was never so practised by any Church of Christ before that time: Ergo, *The Lord Jesus hath not commanded it so to be.*

The *minor* stands good till you give your Instance. The Consequence of the *major* I thus prove,

If the Lord Jesus had so commanded it, then his Apostles would have taught the Churches to have so practised it:

But they did not so teach the Churches: Ergo, *It is not so commanded.*

The

The Consequence of the Major I thus prove,

If the Apostles were faithful in the discharge of their Ministry, and kept back nothing that was profitable to the Churches, but declared unto them the whole Counsel of God, then they did teach the Churches all things their Lord had commanded them. But the Apostles were thus faithful in the discharge of their Ministry: Ergo, *They did teach the Churches all things their Lord had commanded them.*

There is no part of this Argument can be denied, without raising up the very Foundation of Christianity. I shall therefore proceed to prove the *Minor* of my former Syllogism, by the same way that I proceeded before.

If the Apostles did teach the Churches of Christ to sing in Rhime and Metre, with conjoined voices by all the People together, with musical tunes, by a prelimited form, as a Gospel-Ordinance, then it is somewhere so recorded in the New-Testament. But there is no such record to be found in all the New-Testament: Ergo, *The Apostles did not teach the Churches of Christ to sing as aforesaid.*

The Consequence of the *Major* is natural from the premises, and if you deny the *minor* Proposition, you are (as before) obliged to shew us where it is so written in the New Testament.

Thus you may apprehend what a Circle you have brought your selves into, (by pretending your way of singing to be a part of Instituted Worship under the Gospel) out of which I con-

conceive you cannot eaſily extricate your ſelves, you had better have owned it to be a Humane Inſtitution, and have told your members you had agreed upon it at a Church-meeting, as that which would render you like other People in your Aſſemblies; even as *Iſrael* would have a King, becauſe they would be like other Nations; and God gave them their Requeſt, but it was in anger, and tended to their ruin; as this way of Ballad-ſinging hath a tendency to yours, having begun already to diminiſh your Numbers, and force two Congregations to unite into one, to keep up their Reputation, and ſupply that deficiency ſinging in Rhime had made in the loſs of their members. This, as it is a great truth, ſo it is really a matter of Lamentation: Nay further, a great part of your members that remain, are ſo diſſatisfied, that ſo ſoon as you begin to tune your Pipes, they immediately depart like men affrighted. If you were ſtrong, (as you ſuppoſe your ſelves to be) you ought to bear the Infirmities of the Weak, and not thus fooliſhly to pleaſe your own ſelves, and give the World an occaſion to reproach you for your Diviſions.

The Second thing which Mr. *Allen* ſeems ſo much concerned at, is this.

That in thoſe Queries it is ſuggeſted, that the Word *Sung* is added by the Tranſlator in all theſe places following, *viz. Mat.* 26. 30. *Mark* 14. 26. *Acts* 16. 25. *Heb.* 2. 12. becauſe in none of them it is to be found in the Original, and that conſequently all that aſſert ſinging from theſe and the like Scriptures, deceive

others

others, and do very ill in justifying the Translators in adding to the Word of God.

'This Mr. *Allen* saith is a bold presumption 'indeed for any, but especially such as know 'not a word of the Original Text, thus to ar-'raign our Bibles.'

But, pray Sir, why so hasty? how come you to know this to be true? what if they who have affirmed it (whom the Querist refers to) should understand both *Greek* and *Hebrew* as well as your self; where then will this bold presumption be found?

'But, saith Mr. *Allen*, to print and publish 'against their own Teachers and Brethren such 'a heavy Charge as this.'

I answer, If Members may not oppose their own Teachers, when they impose upon them Humane Inventions, in the stead of Christ's pure Precepts, the Church may quickly be brought under sad Circumstances in matters of Worship.

'But, saith Mr. *Allen*, let not any Christian 'be startled at this bold presumption, for I as-'sure you 'tis as groundless as 'tis bold. Excellent Rhetorick, and a proof in *verbo Sacerdotis.*

Now after all this Noise, might not a man reasonably expect, he would have proved that ᾄδω, or some other word that signifies to sing, had been joyned with ὑμνῶ, or ὑμνήσαντες, in some of these Texts? but of this he saith not one word.

And altho' it be not there, yet he labours to perswade his Reader the Translator did well in putting it into our Bibles; and the reason he assigns is, because

cause *Calvin*, *Beza*, *Piscator*, the *French* Translators, and many others have ascribed singing to our Saviour in those Texts, so that he would have us to think it was lawful for them to err with a multitude.

I answer, *First*, Negatively: It is not said that our Saviour *sung* in either of those Texts, notwithstanding Mr. *Allen* hath so often asserted it in his Book, and makes it the main Pillar upon which his singing with conjoined Voices is built.

And therefore as they all fail him in their Evidence, so they are not to be admitted by us as Witnesses, (in their own cause) they being parties.

But cannot Mr. *Allen* prove the word *sung* to be in any one of those Texts? No, not in one of them.

2. But suppose it were as he saith, (for I would grant my Antagonist all the fair play that he could desire) yet unless he could also prove, that this Hymn was sung in Rhime, by a prelimited form of words, in musical verse, as a Gospel-Church-Ordinance, it will not in the least answer his End.

But to put the matter out of doubt, (altho' if their Memories had not failed them, they might have spared my pains herein, it having been done sufficiently already by Mr. *Marlow* and others) I will set down the words in the *Greek*, as they stand recorded in all those places.

In *Mat.* 26. 30. Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες, which *Arias Montanus* renders, *Et Hymno dicto*; and Mr. *Allen*, A Hymn being said.

In

In *Mark* 14. 26. Καὶ ὑμνήσαντες, *Et Hymno dicto*, and a Hymn being said.

In *Acts* 16. 25. Παυλος καὶ Σίλας προσευχόμενοι ὑμνουν τον Θεον. *Arias Mont. Paulus & Silas orantes laudabunt Deum.* *Paul* and *Silas* praying praised God.

In *Heb.* 2. 12. ὑμνησω σε, *Laudabo te*, I will praise thee.

I shall add a fifth place, where the word *sing* is not in the Original.

James 5. 13. The *Greek* Word is Ψαλλέτω, *Psallat*; Let him psalm, and not sing Psalms, as they have translated it.

And herein I have not only *Arias Montanus*, and the Learned *Castellio*, on my side, but Mr. *Allen*'s Old Friend and merry Companion, *Beza*, who also leaves out the word *sing* in this Text, altho' he adds it in the rest.

'But saith Mr. *Allen*, Tho' some of our old 'Translations render it, they said Grace, or 'they Praised God, yet none of them tell us, 'they did it not by singing.

Nor is there any reason why they should, if Mr. *Allen* say true, That to render it a Hymn being said, or to tell us they sang it, implies the same thing.

But will he take this for currant Coin from a Pedo baptist, when he shall tell us, 'The Holy 'Scriptures do indeed say, that Believers were 'baptized, and that by dipping: But they no 'where say, that Infants were not baptized, 'and that by sprinkling; and therefore take 'it for granted that they were; I suppose not. 'And we have as little reason to admit it in 'this.

I hope by this time it's manifeſt to the Reader, that we have neither abuſed Mr. *Allen* nor the Tranſlators.

But ſaith he, 'If this ſhould be believed, it 'would leave all Engliſh Readers in perplexing 'doubts, when they read the mind of God in their 'Bibles, and when inſtead thereof they read the 'Additions of men.

I perceive he is not ſo ſollicitous about the matter, whether it be true, or not true; but he would not have the Engliſh Readers to be told ſo, becauſe they may then call his Authority for ſinging into queſtion: But I hope we that labour to undeceive them, are not to be blamed for ſo doing; but thoſe who have known they were decieved by a corrupt Tranſlation, and would not inform them. This is the true ſtate of the Caſe betwixt you and us.

But why ſhould this be thought ſuch a Bugbear by Mr. *Allen* and his five Champions? Some of them know we ſay true, that there are Errors in our Engliſh Tranſlation, (and that in the caſe depending;) have they not often told the People in their Pulpits, (and I doubt not but they will do it again) that the Original hath it thus or thus, different from that in our Engliſh Bibles: They it ſeems (when they pleaſe) may ſhew their Skill in the Original, but we muſt not do it.

But that I may ſhew you, we are not ſingular in our aſſertion in this point, I will give you the Opinion of that Eminently Learned and Holy Man of God, Mr. *Henry Jeſſey*, as you may read it at large in the Hiſtory of his Life and Death; he doth indeed tell us, it

is

is no dishonour to the Translators, to affirm, that the knowledge of the Hebrew and Greek hath been improved even to Admiration since that time.

Besides, mention might be made of some unhandsom dealing, not in the Translators, but in a great Prelate of that time, the chief Supervisor of that Work; who, as the Reverend Dr. *Hill* declared in a great and honourable Assembly, would have it speak the Prelatical Language, and to that end alter'd it in fourteen places.

Instances of some of them follow:

In *Act.* 12. 4. for Πάσχα, he struck out *Passover*, and put in *Easter*.

Act. 1. 20. instead of *Charge*, he put in *Bishoprick*; which was *Judas* his Bag, or nothing.

Act. 2. 31. he struck out *Grave*, and put in *Hell*; that it might suit with that blind expression in the *Creed*, (which hath puzzled all the World) *He descended into Hell.*

In *Heb.* 9. 1. where the word is Δικαιώματα, *Institutions of Worship*, he puts down *Divine Service*; because they had got a trick to call the *Common-Prayer* by that Name.

In *Act.* 19. 37. instead of *Robbers of the Temple*, he puts in *Robbers of Churches*.

These and such like Alterations were indeed not only against the minds of the Translators, but also of the then Bishop of *Glocester*, who was joined with the other as a Supervisor, and complained of it himself; *But* (saith he) *he is so potent, there is no contradicting him.*

The *Church of England* doth not exempt our last Translation from all deficiency, but do shew

in their Pulpits continually how the Text may be better translated, so, or so.

And when Dr. *Burgess* gives his Opinion about subscribing to Scriptures not rightly rendred, he saith, 'Our Subscription to the *Common-Prayer-Book*, is to approve the reading of such Scriptures as are there appointed to be read, and 'not to justifie the Printers or Translators Errors therein.

These Interpretations King *James* accepted, and the then Archbishop of *Canterbury* affirmed to be the true Sence, Meaning and Intention of the *Church of England*.

Were I minded, I could give you much more of this kind; but lest it should be thought I had some other Intention than what I have proposed, I shall forbear doing it till a further Occasion shall offer it self.

By this time I hope it will not seem to Mr. *Allen* to be so great a Crime as he thought it had been, to question him for justifying our Translation in some few particular Instances.

But why should I trouble my self to contend with one who either is not a competent Judge of Translations, or else is not sincere, but guilty of handling the Word of God deceitfully, and doth what in him lies (in the Case before us) to cheat the Understanding of his English Reader.

For in the close of his Book he saith, 'It being asserted in this Treatise, that the Divine 'Book of *Psalms* were written by the holy Penmen in Hebrew metre, and some of them in 'Rhime, not only in the Original Sence of the 'Word, as it denotes no more than Verse or 'Number, but also in the Vulgar Notion of it.

The

The Vulgar Notion is equal Feet, and a Chyming at the end, such as is found in the Writings of our English Poets and Ballad-makers, in imitation of which, *Marot* began to translate the *Psalms* into French, for the use of the King, which he sung as he had done his other Ballads; and which *Hopkins*, *Sternhold*, and others, did afterwards imitate in English Rhime.

Let not the word *Ballad-singing* sound amiss in the Ears of our new upstart Singers; for we have an English Translation that calls the *Song of Solomon*, *The Ballad of Ballads*. And if Mr. *Allen* can prove this Assertion of his to be true, *Erit mihi magnus Apollo.*

But to proceed: He further saith, 'It was 'desired by a worthy Minister that I should set 'down two or three Examples of it; which I 'was the more willing to comply with, because 'of the Confidence of a late Writer, who de-'nies it.

The Examples (he gives) follow, and I believe they are such that no mortal that understands *Hebrew* would have given, except himself; for all Rhime is Metre, though all Metre is not Rhime: But there is not one of all his four Instances Metre.

Now suppose he had pick'd out three or four true Verses, both in Rhime and Metre, out of an Hundred and fifty Psalms, can any man in his right Wits conclude from thence, that the whole are in Rhime and metre? Surely, No; but that it rather fell out by chance, as it sometimes happens in our common Discourse.

And when I have made it appear, that Mr. *Allen* hath been so unhappy as to fail in all his Instances,

then I hope the Reader will be satisfied, that it is not such a bold, ignorant and confident Assertion, but a great Truth, to affirm, That the *Psalms of David* were not originally written in Rhime.

I shall observe this method, for the English Reader's better Satisfaction:

1. Set down the Hebrew Words in Hebrew Characters.
2. The Hebrew Words in English Characters.
3. The matter of them in English Words and English Characters, that it may be made obvious to all.

I shall begin with his first Example, *Psal.* 8. 5. but the words are in *ver.* 4.

מָה־אֱנוֹשׁ כִּי־תִזְכְּרֶנּוּ

וּבֶן־אָדָם כִּי תִפְקְדֶנּוּ

Mah-enosh ki-tizkerennu?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Uben adam, ki tiphkedennu?
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

What is man, that thou art mindful of him?
And the son of man, that thou visitest him?

Here it's manifest, 1*st*. That these are unequal Feet, one having eight Syllables, and the other nine. 2*dly*. That the English, although it be Prose, and intended for no other; yet it's as good Rhime as the Hebrew, and as good metre; for the first line is ten, and the second is eleven syllables.

His

His second Example is *Psal.* 63. 3. but the words are in *ver.* 2.

I doubt the Contrivance is not his own, because he hath twice mist the right Verse.

כֵּן בַּקֹּדֶשׁ חֲזִיתִךָ

לִרְאוֹת עֻזְּךָ וּכְבוֹדֶךָ

Ken bakkodesh chaziticha,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Lirot gnuzzecha ucheboḍecha.
ד 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10

To see thy power and thy glory,
So as I have seen the in the sanctuary.

1*st.* Observe how unequal the Feet are.

2*dly.* That the English is as good Rhime as the Hebrew, and for metre they are both alike; for in the Hebrew there is eight syllables in one line, and ten in another: In the English there is nine syllables in one line, and eleven in the other; and yet we all know that the Reading Psalms were never intended for either Rhime or metre.

His third Example is *Psal.* 116. 7.

שׁוּבִי נַפְשִׁי לִמְנוּחָיְכִי

כִּי־יְהוָה גָּמַל עָלָיְכִי

Shubi napshi limnuchajechi,
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Ki-Jehovah gamal gnalajechi.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10.

Return unto thy rest, O my Soul,
For the Lord hath dealt bountifully with thee.

The fourth and last Example he gives, is *Psal.* 148. 1, 2.

הַלְלוּ יְהוָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם

הַלְלוּהוּ בַּמְּרוֹמִים

Halelujah min hashshamajim;
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Halelluhu bammeromim.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Praise ye the Lord from the Heavens;
Praise him in the heights.

Thus Mr. *Allen* hath set it down in his Book, and yet it is not metre; for one hath nine syllables, and the other hath but eight.

Let us now see how the words are in the Hebrew Text:

הַלְלוּיָהּ הַלְלוּ אֶת־יְהוָה מִן־הַשָּׁמַיִם

חַלְלוּהוּ בַּמְּרוֹמִים

Halelujah halelu et Jehovah min hashshamajim;
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9 10 11 12 13 14 15 16

Halelluhu

Halelubu bammeromim.
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Praise ye the Lord; Praise ye Jehovah from the Heavens:
Praise him in the heights.

So that you see plainly the vast difference between the words in the Text, and as set down in Mr. *Allen*'s Book; for there is in the Hebrew sixteen syllables in the first line, and but eight in the last.

Doth this look like Rhime and Metre? This must be done on purpose to deceive his English Reader; for he hath left out these words in the Hebrew Text, *Halelu et Jehovah*, which con-
1 2 3 4 5 6 7
tains seven syllables, and fifteen letters, on purpose to make his Reader believe it was both Rhime and metre.

From hence it's plain, the most Sacred and Incommunicable Name of God, which denotes his Essence, viz. *Jehovah*, must be razed out of the Book of God, to make it Rhime for the pleasing of their Fancies. Doth this become those five Ministers who have set their Names to Mr. *Allen*'s Book? It looks as if they were resolved, *fas aut nefas*, right or wrong, to bear down all that stands in their way, rather than lay down this humane Invention of Ballad-Singing.

The

The ſecond Verſe is thus,

הַלְלוּהוּ כָּל מַלְאָכָיו

הַלְלוּהוּ כָּל צְבָאָו

Haleluhu col-malachaiu
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8 9

Haleluhu col-tzeba-au
1 2 3 4 5 6 7 8

Praiſe ye him all his Angels;
Praiſe ye him all his Hoſts.

This you ſee is not Metre, and therefore never intended for Rhime; for the firſt line hath nine, and the laſt but eight; and *Solomon* ſaith, *The legs of the lame are not equal.*

Now you ſee what is become of the Advice of his worthy Servant, for he hath failed him in all his Examples.

I deſire the Reader to obſerve by the way, that if Mr. *Allen* ſhall pick and chooſe, out of a Hundred and fifty Pſalms, what Verſes he pleaſes, from *Pſal.* 8. to *Pſal.* 148. and yet cannot find one true Verſe, then all his huffing againſt me and others will avail him nothing. For ſuppoſe he had been bound to defend any one whole Pſalm to be Rhime, what a hard Work would he have undertaken?

But

But to be trifled with no longer by him, I affirm, That any man that understands Hebrew, may as easily know that the *Psalms* were not originally written in Rhime, as he may know the difference between our *Reading* and the *Singing Psalms*. But if men will be wilful and foolish, and put themselves and others to trouble, their Ignorance and Pride must be exposed to the view of all, when it comes in competition with God's Word: And in case they shall any more insist upon this Subject, I will make it so manifest, that every English Reader shall be capable to understand it; and then whether these Ministers will confess their wilful or ignorant Opposition against the Truth, or not, I cannot help it.

For if all these Gentlemen do understand Hebrew, then it is a wilful and premeditated Cheat: If they do not understand it, then it's Presumption in them to oppose such that do, and at the same time tell them, they know not a word of the Original Text.

But now suppose all this were true, (which is indeed utterly false) that they had been written in Rhime, and that select men in the Church of the Jews had sung them so, with their Instruments of Musick, what had this been to us under the Gospel? For we are delivered from that Yoke of Bondage the Jews lay under, by the Coming of the *Messiah*: He hath, by his Death, took away the First Covenant, that he might establish the Second. We are now under the New Covenant, which is a better than the Old; it hath a better Mediator, better Laws, better Promises, and is (in the whole of it) a more Spiritual Dispensation; not attended with Outward Pomp and Glory,

Glory, or with common Musical Singing and Dancing, and great External Splendour; but the *King's Daughter* now is all glorious within, endowed with the Gifts and Graces of the Holy Spirit, and is to act all her Duties from a principle of Grace and Holiness within; she needs no Instruments of Musick to stir her Affections, nor any Flesh-pleasing Tunes, or musical Rhime, to make her merry; for the Spirit fills Her with Joy and Peace, through Believing; and when he hath a mind to glorifie himself by any Outward Melody, he will not want the Assistance of our Singers to indite Tunes to express it by. And indeed, it's strange they should think, that no Praises offered up to God, in and through his Son, should please him so well as the Rhimes of *Hopkins*, *Sternhold*, and others.

I had thought here to have put a stop to my Pen, and have said no more at this time upon this Subject; but by the Importunity of several worthy Friends, I was prevailed with to take notice of some few things more in Mr. *Allen*'s *Essay*, lest it should be supposed by some I had ommitted some of the most material Passages therein.

I shall therefore, in answer to their Desire, observe what follows:

In Mr. *Allen*'s *Essay*, *chap.* 1. *pag.* 5. he tells us, 'He shall endeavour to shew, that Singing 'the Praises of God is a Christian Duty, and 'that it was not peculiar to the Jewish Dispensation.

But why doth not Mr. *Allen* state the Question as it ought to be stated, but leave out the most material Expressions upon which it depends? Mr. *Allen*

Mr. *Allen* gives us the Reason of it in his Epistle; for he saith, "That what he hath omitted in any "one place, he hath endeavoured to supply in "another, for our full Satisfaction.

Now in his Fifth and Sixth Chapters he gives his Judgment for Singing in Verse or Rhime, rather than Prose, and that in Musical Verse, by Artificial Tunes; which is indeed their way of Singing, and therefore we are bound to understand him in that sence, according to his own Explanation.

I shall therefore lay down his Position, as he would have us understand it:

'That Singing the Praises of God, not in Prose, 'but in metre and Rhime, with an extention of 'the Voice, and a peculiar modulation thereof in 'musical Verse, by Artifical Tunes, with con-'joined Voices of all the People together, and 'that by a prelimited Form, (*viz.* the *Psalms* 'of *David*, as translated into Rhime,) is a Chri-'stian Duty, and not peculiar to the Jewish Dis-'pensation.

This (saith he) *I shall prove these three ways:*

First, *From its being a Moral Duty.*

Secondly, *From the Example of our Lord Jesus herein.*

Thirdly, *From the Apostolical Injunctions thereof.*

I shall briefly consider these Three ways by which he Essays to prove it, in the Order he hath placed them.

First, He saith it is a *Moral Duty:* And before he proceeds to prove it, he tells us a long Story of the distinction betwixt *Moral* and meer *Positive Duties*, and gives several Instances in things wholly foreign to the matter in Controversie.

But

But in *Pag.* 8. he saith, 'It's a *Moral Duty*, 'for men to praise God with all the Faculties 'wherewith he has endowed them; and because 'they are able to praise him with their Mouths as 'well as their Hearts, therefore they ought to 'do it.

Now I know not of any Adversary he hath in the World in this Point; for it's generally agreed that we ought so to do, and that we are so taught by the Dictates of Nature; so that he hath spent several Pages to no purpose.

But after this he tells us, 'That it is not only 'to be done by Speaking, but also by Singing his 'Praise.

Now we must enquire, what he means by *Singing?* He tells us, in his Answer to this Question, what *Singing* is, *pag.* 29, *&c.* 'That the word 'שִׁיר, *Shur*, with its Derivatives, is used in 'Scripture above a hundred times, to denote '*Singing*, and signifies primarily to *Extend*, and 'to *Sing*, because therein there is an Extension 'of the Voice: Whence (saith he) 'tis evi-'dent, there is no Singing properly without an 'Extension of the Voice; which will be more 'clear by considering another word, רָנַן, *Ranan*, 'whose primary and general sence is, to make any 'loud Noise: And therefore he tells us, it's thence used to denote Singing; plainly intimating to us, that that consists properly in making a loud Noise with our Voices.

Now if this be so, then I perceive we may perform this Duty in Prose as well as they can in Rhime, if we do but make a loud Noise with our Voices when we render Praises to God.

But

But the whole ſtreſs of the Controverſie conſiſts in this; Not, whether Praiſing God be a *Moral Duty*; but, whether ſuch a Praiſing of God in Rhime, which they contend for, is a *Moral Duty?*

I anſwer, It is not; nor can it poſſibly be ſo, for this Reaſon: Becauſe the Light of Nature, although it may teach that there is a God, and that this God is to be worſhipped, and that we ought to worſhip him according to his own Preſcription, ſo far as he ſhall reveal his Will to us, yet it never could teach us how this God muſt be worſhipped; and until our Singers can prove it in any other inſtance, they ought not to inſiſt upon it in this, it being a baffled Cauſe in Mr. *Allen*'s Congregation long ago.

Secondly, He ſaith, Singing the Praiſes of God was a Duty performed to him by the heavenly Angels, at the diſcovery of the glorious Perfections in the Creation, and therefore infers, it is a *Moral Duty*. To prove his Aſſertion, he quotes *Job* 38.7. *When the morning ſtars ſang together, and the ſons of God ſhouted for joy.*

I ſhall firſt deny, that there is any other thing intended by *Stars* in that place than the material ones; for divers of them are called by their Names in that very Chapter, as in *ver.* 31, &c. there is mention'd the *Pleiades*, (or Seven Stars) *Orion* with his *Bands*: And its ſaid, *Canſt thou bring forth Mazzaroth in his ſeaſon?* The Hebrew word מַזָּרוֹת, *Mazzarot*, ſignifies the *Planets*, or Twelve Signs in which they move, which are ſo many Conſtellations of the Stars, giving their Influence upon the Earth. And there is particularly mentioned

tioned *Arcturus* with his Sons, which is a Celestial Constellation in the form of a Bear, about the North Pole; and after this, it follows, *Knowest thou the ordinances of Heaven? canst thou set the dominion thereof in the earth?* So that this hath no relation to the Angels, but sets forth the blessed Harmony there was in all the Works of the Creation in this lower World, before Sin had marr'd it by the Fall of *Adam*.

Besides, if he will bring a doubtful Interpretation from a Text, he ought to prove his Interpretation from some plain Text: But he hath not given us any Instance that the Angels did ever sing, and I know of none there is to be given; if there be, let him produce it, and then he may expect an Answer to it, and not before.

But further, Had not Mr. *Allen* been resolved to Trifle in this matter, for want of Proof, he would have took notice of what Mr. *Marlow* has said upon this Text, in his *Truth soberly Defended*, in Answer to Mr. *Keach*'s *Breach repair'd*; where all that he hath said upon it is fully answer'd, four years before his Book was published.

It's a sad thing to have to do with such men, that neither know how to give or receive Answers.

But suppose the Angels had sung, which remains yet to be proved, this is no necessary consequence, that therefore the Light of Nature teaches us so to do.

But whilst he was writing this, he had certainly forgot what the Angels are in their own Beings: They are Spirits devoid of Bodily Organs, and of a Nature very distinct and superior to ours: And yet when he is to prove, that Singing the Praises

Praiſes of God with our mouths is a *moral duty*, he brings in the Angels for an Inſtance: It plainly appears from hence he is unacquainted with the Doctrine of Spirits, and of the manner by which they perform their Operations; for as they take up things by an intuitive knowledge, ſo they act in a way ſuitable to their own Natures, not to be demonſtrated by us whilſt we live in Houſes of Clay.

Thirdly, He ſaith, Whatſoever was practiſed in the Church of God, and approved by him before the giving of the Law at Mount *Sinai*, and never afterward declared to be typical, is a moral duty.

Where the Logick of this lies I know not, but we will examine it, and ſee if we can find it out.

1. Why before the giving of the Law upon Mount *Sinai?* was there no moral duty practiſed by the Church of God after that time? how comes this diſtinction of time to prove this or that a moral duty?

Pray let Mr. *Allen* tell us, whether that prohibition given to *Noah*, Gen. 9. 4. *But fleſh with the life thereof, which is the blood thereof, ſhall ye not eat*, be a moral duty; for it was practiſed by the Church of God before the giving of the Law upon Mount *Sinai*, and unleſs he can ſhew us that it was declared typical, and tell us what it was a Type of, it muſt be a moral duty in his underſtanding.

If he ask his Friend Mr. *Stennet*, who is one of his five Champions; he muſt tell him, that the ſeventh-day-Sabbath was a moral duty, al-

tho' it were typical, and given before the Law upon Mount *Sinai*. And on the contrary, Mr. *Allen* must deny it to be a moral duty because it's typical; how these Men come to set their Hands to a Position, so opposite to each others understanding, I know not; but tho' they differ in many other things, it seems they can agree about singing, and that is now become their *Shibboleth*.

I had thought that all Christians had generally agreed, that the Summ of all moral duties had been comprehended in the Law of the Decalogue, altho' they are not agreed, that as it was there delivered, the whole of it is simply moral; and if so, then Mr. *Allen*'s best way had been to have proved singing to be commanded (not before, but) at the giving of the Law upon mount *Sinai*, and that would have appeared with a more seeming probability to have furnished him with an Argument to have proved it a moral duty.

2. But why doth he say, that singing was practised in the Church of God as such?

To prove it, he brings only this single Instance, *Exod.* 15. 1. *Then sang Moses and the Children of Israel this Song to the Lord.*

I answer, 1. By denying that this was done as a Church-act: That they were not excited to it from any spiritual and Internal Joy, stirred up by an encrease of any Gifts or Graces of the Spirit bestowed upon them at that time, as Members of the Church of God, but from some other considerations, is evident from the account given in the Text.

For it was upon that mighty deliverance that God

God gave them at the Red Sea, when *Pharaoh* and his Hoſt were purſuing them with rage and malice, to have deſtroyed their Bodies by the Sword, becauſe they were leaving his Countrey, and he ſhould looſe ſo many Subjects and Vaſſals, whom he had enſlaved to their great affliction, and his great profit. Now God having preſerved them in that miraculous manner, and ſo eminently ſignalized his power in the deſtruction of their Enemies, they therefore brake forth into this great extaſie of ſinging his Praiſes, having the great Prophet of the Old Teſtament to direct them in it.

So that it doth not at all appear, that it was performed as a Church-act, but upon an outward and civil conſideration: Beſides, how he will do to prove they were then formed into a Church-ſtate, when all the Laws for the eſtabliſhing the *Jewiſh Oeconomy* were given after that time, I cannot readily apprehend; nor yet how he will prove that they ſung in Rhime, ſeeing the Song it ſelf, as recorded in the Scripture, is not in Rhime.

Furthermore, It may be obſerved, that they did not perform this Duty as Mr. *Allen* and part of his Congregation do, by ſinging promiſcuouſly, Men and Women together, for the Women had more modeſty (I perceive) than ſome of our Women have now; for they did not ſing together with the men, but went out by themſelves; for in *Exod.* 15. 20, 21. it's ſaid, *And Miriam the Propheteſs, the ſiſter of Aaron, took a timbrel in her hand, and all the women went out after her with timbrels and with dances; and Miriam anſwered them, Sing ye to the Lord, for he hath tri-*

triumphed gloriously, the Horse and his Rider hath he thrown into the Sea.

And pray let Mr. *Allen* give us in his next a better reason than he hath yet done, why singing for this outward deliverance from *Egyptian* Slavery, should not be as good a Type of our spiritual deliverance by Christ, and the Joy that results therefrom, as that of the use of timbrels and dancing should be a Type of Joyfulness of Heart under the Gospel, as he tells, but hath not proved it. And in case that the matter of their Song was typical, then by his own Argument it was not a moral duty.

But for your further satisfaction in this matter, if you will but consult the Scriptures, you will find that before the Temple-worship was erected, it was frequent for those People, upon any National Deliverance, or any great Victory obtained over their enemies, to sing and dance with Instruments of musick, as you have an account of the Song of *Deborah*, Judg. 5. upon that account, and that of *Jephthah*'s Daughter, and the Maidens her Companions, *Judg.* 11. and that of the womens going out of all the Cities of *Israel*, singing and dancing, to meet King *Saul*, when he returned from the slaughter of the *Philistines*, with Tabrets, with Joy, and with Instruments of musick, 1 *Sam.* 18. 6. the like we read about *David*'s bringing back the Ark to the City of *David*, 2 Sam. 6. 14, 15, 16. and if their singing was a moral duty, the other must be such also, (if the distinction of time makes a thing to be, or not not be a moral duty) and I am sure he has not yet proved it otherwise.

And I desire the Reader to observe, that in all

all these places there is not one word of their singing in Rhime, which is the thing he should have proved, if he could have done it, for otherwise it is nothing at all to his purpose.

But, *Fourthly*, He saith, that such singing is enjoined upon all men of all Nations, and therefore a moral duty.

Observ. 1. That he hath omitted a principal member in this Argument: For he should have said, that such singing was enjoined upon all men of all Nations by the light of Nature, and therefore a moral duty: And if he had proved that, then the consequence had been good; but instead of that, he tells us it is so revealed in the Word of God, and brings several Texts of Scripture to prove it.

I shall therefore in the *Second* place examine those Texts by him alledged for probation thereof, *Psalm* 98. 4. and 100. 1, 2. and 47. 7. in *Psalm* 98. 4. *Make a joyful noise all the Earth, make a loud noise, and rejoyce, and sing*; those Words, *All the Earth*, seem to fall under that Trope called by Rhetoricians *Senecdoche totius integralis*, divers Examples of it are to be found amongst those eminently Learned; *Ut cum posuit Cicero, orbem terrarum pro Imperio Romano*; the like figure of Speech is used *Luke* 2. 1. *There went out a Decree from Cesar Augustus, that all the world should be taxed*; whereby is intended, only that part of it in subjection to the *Roman* Yoke; For אֶרֶץ, *Aretz*, is a Noun primitive, signifying Earth or Land, and it's applied to a particular Countrey, *viz.* the Land of *Egypt*, in the Decalogue, and in divers other places: And in the 1*st*. verse it's said why they should rejoice, be-

cause *God had done marvellous things, his right Hand, and his holy Arm hath gotten him the Victory*: In the 2*d.* verse, *He hath done this in the sight of the Heathen*: In verse 3*d. He hath remembred his mercy and his truth toward the house of Israel*: And in the verse he hath cited, we have a further Exhortation to these People, for whom these great things had been done, and this Victory obtained, to make a joyful noise, and to sing; and in the following words they are directed how to sing, with the Harp, and the voice of a Psalm, with Trumpet and sound of Cornet. Now as it is here applied to the People for whom this was done, and the House of *Israel* particularly expreſt, and only said to be done in the sight of the Heathen, altho' the word *Earth* be here used, it's more probable it's to be taken for the Land of *Canaan*, for whose Inhabitants God had done such great things, than for all the Inhabitants of the Universe; and unless Mr. *Allen* can prove it to be otherwise, it doth not avail him to prove it a moral Duty. Besides, if that mode of singing, there expres'd, be a moral Duty, *viz.* to have Harps, Trumpets, and the sound of of Cornets joined with it, why do not they practise it? For I do not hear that they have as yet brought into use any such Instruments of musick in their Assemblies.

In *Psalm* 100. ver. 1, 2. *Make a joyful noise unto the Lord, all ye Lands, serve the Lord with gladness, come before his presence with singing*: Now the same word that in the 98*th.* Psalm is rendred *All the Earth*, is here rendred *All ye Lands*, intending thereby those Lands which God had given them in possession, and cast out the Inhabitants thereof

from

from before them; and this is plain in *ver.* 3, & 4. where it is restrained to his People, and the Sheep of his Pasture, when they enter into his Gates with thanksgiving, and into his Courts with Praise: So that this cannot be intended all the World.

In *Psalm* 47. 7. *God is the King of all the Earth, sing ye with understanding:* Here Mr. *Allen* dislikes the Translation, and would have it be rendred, *Let every one that hath understanding sing praises unto him.* He may (I perceive) quarrel with the Translators, but we must not: Now I will take it as he would have it, for it's reasonable to allow him all we can, but then we must consider who it's spoken to, not all the World, but the Children of *Israel*, God's peculiar People only, therefore every one of them that have understanding should praise him; that it is so, is evident from the Scope of the Place, as also for that they are not only named by Name, but also distinguished from all other Nations, *ver.* 3, 4. *He shall subdue the people under us, and the Nations under our feet: He shall choose our Inheritance for us, the Excellency of Jacob whom he loved,* Selah. And in ver. 9. *They are called the People of the God Abraham.*

It was wisely done of Mr. *Allen*, not to set down these Texts at length; lest thereby he should have confuted himself, and saved me the Labour.

5*ly.* Mr. *Allen* saith, 'Whatever is preferr'd 'before the most Excellent Parts of Ceremonial 'Worship, as more pleasing to God, is a moral 'duty. Now I expected it should have followed, But singing in Rhime, as we practise it, is preferr'd before the most Excellent Parts of Ceremonial Worship, and therefore it's a moral

Duty: But perhaps he may not be skilled in Logick, and then it must not be expected from him.

But it follows, To know God, and to love him above all, to love our Neighbour as our selves, to do Justice and Judgment, to be merciful to the miserable, these are preferr'd before the most excellent sacrifices, which were the chief parts of the Ceremonial Worship, therefore, *&c.* it should have been: 'But, saith he, 'and why? But because the former are moral 'Duties, and good in themselves; whereas the latter are only positive Duties, and good because commanded.

But what is all this to his Purpose, to prove singing in Rhime, as they practise it, with tunable voices, *&c.* a moral Duty?

Take his own Answer, 'And that singing to 'the Praise of God is a Duty of the same Na'ture, I conclude, because 'tis like them, pre'ferr'd before the most excellent Sacrifice, as be'ing more pleasing to God; and is not content to give us his own *Ipse dixit* for it, but saith also, thus the Psalmist tells us, *Psal.* 69. 30, 31.

This is saying of things which are liable to very great Exceptions, and a confused loose sort of way of reasoning, as is obvious to every considerate Reader.

But, Sir, every like is not the same; I pray, how come singing to the praise of God in metre and rhime, with tunable and conjoined voices, to be like to, and equal with our knowing and loving God above all, and our Neighbour as our selves, *&c?* whereas the latter are the highest acts of the rational Soul, and the most substantial

tial parts of Religion, and the former only a mode of Worſhip, never commanded by God? and if it had, could have been only poſitive, and a meer ritual?

We will now examine the Text he urges to prove it.

Pſalm. 63. 30, 31. *I will praiſe the Name of God with a Song, and will magnifie him with thankſgiving: This alſo ſhall pleaſe the Lord better than an Ox or Bullock that hath horns and hoofs.*

For our better underſtanding theſe words, we will conſider the Scope of the place, which is a true guide in the Interpretation of Holy Scripture. The Deſign therefore of the Pſalmiſt being to ſet forth the ſtate of Chriſt in his Humiliation and Sufferings, when he was upon the Earth, it ought to be applied to him.

That it is ſo applied, I ſhall inſtance in ſome few paſſages, *ver.* 9. is applied to Chriſt in *John* 2. 17. *His Diſciples remembred that it was written, the zeal of thine Houſe hath eaten me up:* And the words following are ſo applied by the Apoſtle *Paul*, Rom. 15. 3. *For even Chriſt pleaſed not himſelf, but as it is written, the reproaches of them that reproached thee fell on me:* The 21*ſt.* verſe was alſo fulfilled in the Perſon of our Saviour when upon the Croſs, *They gave me alſo Gall for my meat, and in my thirſt they gave me Vinegar to drink*; as you may ſee fully teſtified in *Mat.* 27. 34, and 48. *Mark* 15. 36. *John* 19. 29. This therefore cannot be denied to be the true Scope of the place, when we have three Evangeliſts and an Apoſtle to aſſert it.

Now the Pſalmiſt being let into the Knowledge of our Salvation by Chriſt, he ſeeing this be-

before, ſpake of it as a thing already paſt, and in the 29*th.* verſe acknowledges his own miſerable ſtate, as being *Poor and ſorrowful in himſelf*; but ſeeing there was Salvation to be had from Chriſt, that is ſufficient to comfort him, he pours out this Earneſt Prayer to God, *Let thy ſalvation, O God, ſet me up on high!* and what would *David* do then? *I will praiſe the name of God with a Song, and will magnifie him with thankſgiving:* And this reſulted from the ſence he had upon him, of that full ſatisfaction God had accepted for Sinners in the ſacrifice of his Son, as is plain from the ſcope of the place, and is alſo fully expreſt in the verſe following; this (*viz.* the Sacrifice of Chriſt) ſhall pleaſe the Lord better than all the Sacrifices under the Law, which were but Types of him, who is the great and moſt acceptable Sacrifice; and therefore he puts down *Inſtar omnium*, an Ox or Bullock, the moſt chargeable of their Sacrifices.

From hence you may ſee, It doth not reſpect his mode of praiſing God, but the matter of it, the Sacrifice of Chriſt.

I have now replied to all thoſe ways by which he hath attempted to prove their mode of ſinging a natural or moral Duty, and have ſhewn you, that his Aſſertion from thoſe Topicks is altogether groundleſs, and therefore muſt fall together with his large Superſtructure he hath built upon it.

I had a purpoſe in this place to have made it manifeſt, that the Light of Nature, when it was at the height of its perfection, as it was in *Adam* in the day of his Innocency, was not capable (without Divine Revelation) to inſtruct

ſtruct man in all the Duties he owed to God, nor in any mode of worſhip he was to perform, much leſs is it capable ſo to do ſince the Fall. But ſeeing Mr. *Marlow* hath largely inſiſted upon it, in his *Truth ſoberly defended*, p. 12, 13, 14, 15. I refer the Reader thither for ſatisfaction, and ſhall proceed to the next Section.

'*Sect.* 2. Mr. *Allen* ſaith, he ſhall prove ſing-'ing to the Praiſe of God is the Duty of every 'Chriſtian, from the Example of Chriſt.

I deſire the Reader to keep in mind what ſort of ſinging he intends his Reader ſhould underſtand by theſe words, *viz.* ſinging in rhime, with a tunable voice, *&c.* or elſe it's nothing to his purpoſe. And I pray take notice (once for all) that his dividing his poſition into ſo many parts, and ſpeaking to each of them by themſelves, was on purpoſe to blind the minds of his unwary Reader, and never prove the thing in queſtion between us; and therefore his way is all along to conclude what he hath never proved, and from thence to infer in his next, as if he had proved it without exception; and that hath occaſioned his drawing ſo many falſe Concluſions, becauſe he hath not well eſtabliſhed the Premiſes upon which they are built, before he leaves them.

But how doth he prove our Saviour ſung? That this was his practice in Religious Worſhip, (he ſaith) is recorded, *Mat.* 26. 30. *Mark* 14. 26. I wonder at the Man's confidence, to bring theſe Texts to prove his Aſſertion, when there is not one word ſpoken of it in either of the places. For,

1. I deny that it is ſaid in either of theſe Texts, that

that our Saviour *sung*, and let him prove it if he can.

For I have already shewed, that the word *Sung* is not in the Original, and I do here tell him again, that in his sence it's neither expressed nor included.

2. I deny that there is an account in any other place in the New Testament, that our Lord Jesus did sing at any other time; if there be, let him assign it.

If he shall instance in *Heb.* 2. 12. I have already shewed that the word *sing* is not in the *Greek*, but added in the last translation.

But seeing it's the Opinion of some, and that with some seeming probability, that this Epistle being written by a *Jew*, to his Brethren the *Jews*, was first composed in the *Hebrew* Tongue, as well as the Gospel of *Matthew*, and therefore the quotation being from *Psalm* 22. *v.* 22. which was originally written in *Hebrew*, we will see how it agrees with the *Hebrew*, in the Epistle to the *Hebrews*, Chap. 2. 12.

The words in both are the same, but our Translators have added *sing* in the one, but not in the other: And that you may be satisfied I do not deceive you, I will set down the words, as they stand recorded in both places.

Psalm 22. *v.* 22.

אֲסַפְּרָה שִׁמְךָ לְאַחָי בְּתוֹךְ קָהָל אֲהַלְלֶךָּ׃

Asapperah Shimcha le-echai; betoch kahal ahalelecha.

In

In *Hebrews* 2. *v.* 12.

אֲסַפְּרָה שִׁמְךָ לְאַחָי בְּתוֹךְ קָהָל אֲהַלְלֶךָּ׃

Aſapperah Shimcha le-echai; betoch Kahal a halelecha.

Thus you ſee they are the ſame, *verbatim* and *literatim.*

And indeed who could imagine, that the great Apoſtle of the *Gentiles* ſhould falſifie the words he pretends to cite, ſo that the words are to be read, *I will declare thy Name unto my Brethren, in the midſt of the Congregation will I praiſe thee:* And the word *ſing* is not in the *Hebrew* in either place: See *Robertſon*'s *Hebrew* New-Teſtament.

Beſides in divers old Bibles in *Engliſh* we have the words ὑμνήσω σε, *hymneſó ſe*, rendered, *I will praiſe thee*, without the addition of the word *Sing.*

Now the reaſon why our laſt Tranſlators have made this addition, was not from a different underſtanding of the Words, becauſe they have rendred them ſo in *Pſalm* 22. *v.* 22. but their affectation to ſinging in Rhime, it being then brought into common uſe, moved them to make this addition in *Heb.* 2. 12. and the ſame reaſon hath excited our preſent Singers to juſtifie their additions to the Word of God; a ſad thing! that Opinion ſhould be preferr'd to the truth of the Sacred Scripture.

Thus you ſee there is no ſufficient reaſon to conclude, that our Lord ſung this Hymn with his Diſciples, (or that they themſelves ſang at that time) nor any undoubted Inſtance of his ſinging praiſes to his Father as our Pattern, ſo that

that Mr. *Allen* hath failed in this Instance, from the practie of our Saviour, to prove that singing the Praises of God is the Duty of every Christian; because he hath not proved that our Lord did sing, either at this, or any other time.

'*Sect.* 3. Mr. *Allen* tells us, his third Argu-'ment is grounded upon the Apostolical Injun-'ctions thereof.

He begins with the Apostle *James*'s words, *James* 1.13. *Is any merry, let him sing Psalms.*

I answer, The word *sing* is not in the *Greek*, and he knows it is not there, and therefore such a Quotation is horrid trifling, both with the People of his Congregation and the Word of God: And I am ashamed to think, that Men of such Parts as his five Champions are, should set their Hands to justifie so many known untruths as are in his Book: For they know the whole stress of the Controversie depends upon the addition of the Word *sing*, and they know it is added in the Translation.

The words are ἐυθυμεῖ τις, ψαλλετω, it's rendred by *Arias Montanus*, *Æquo animo est quis? Psallat*; *Castellio* hath it, *Lætus est quis? Psallat*; *Is any merry? let him psalm*; it is not sing Psalms, as they have rendred it in our last translation. I will add thereto the Testimony of *Beza*, who was the principal man to bring singing in Rhime into use, as it's now practised; and of whom it's reported in a Book long since printed, to set forth the time of bringing humane Inventions into the Church, *Beza* being much diverted with Poetry, made his pastime to become

come a part of the vulgar devotion; hence they have been ſtyled by ſome, *Geneva* Jigs.

Now this man leaves out the word *ſing* in this Text, altho' he hath added it in the other places; his words are theſe, *Bono animo eſt aliquis? pſallat*; Is any of a good mind? let him pſalm. By all this it's manifeſt, the word *ſing* is not in the Text.

Queſt. But it may be asked, What is the meaning of the word *Pſalm?*

I anſwer, the *Hebrew* word תְּהִלָּה, *Tehillah*, ſignifies praiſe, or praiſing, a Pſalm, *pl. maſc.* תְּהִלִּים, *Tehillim*, Pſalms, Praiſes: Hence the Book of *Pſalms* hath its Name, *Sepher Tehillim*, the Book of Pſalms or Praiſes. And from the ſame Radix with the other comes that word *Hallelu*, which being joined with a Name of God, is, הַלְלוּיָהּ, *Hallelujah*, Praiſe ye the Lord, it being compoſed of the Imperative *Piel*, הַלְלוּ, *halelu*, Praiſe ye, and the proper name of God יָהּ, *Jah*, this is the proper and prime Signification of the word.

If we conſider the *Greek* word ψάλλω, *pſallo*, it is properly to touch, whence it is that *Euripides* ſaith, that Muſitians do ψάλλειν χόρδας, *Pſallein Chordas*, touch the Strings: And hence with reſpect to the uſe of it under the Law, and among the *Grecians* alſo, they uſed to expreſs themſelves thus, *Fidibus cano*, to ſing or play on a Lute or Harp; ſo *qui ſcit fidibus ludere*, he that knew how to play on ſuch an Inſtrument, was called ψάλτης *vel* ψάλτης, one skillful therein; and ψαλμος is properly a ſong play'd upon the Pſaltery or Harp, and therefore (with their good leave) he that compoſed the

the

the Psalm, sent it to those Masters of Musick, to play it upon the Harp, the Timbrel, the Psaltery, *&c.* See *Psalm* 81. 2, *&c.* their Instrumental musick was, 1. *Shalishim*, an Instrument of three strings, 1 *Sam.* 18. 6. 2. An Instrument called *Shusan*, *Hexachordon*, with six strings, *Psalm* 60. in the Title. 3. In the Title of the 4*th.* Psalm, *To the chief Musitian on* Neginoth, *a Psalm of David*; and of the 6*th. Psalm*, *upon* Sheminith, *an Instrument of eight strings.* 4. Grashur, Decachordon, *An instrument of ten strings*, with others too tedious to relate.

It is true ᾠδή, *Ode*, is a general word, and signifieth a Singing that is framed by an humane Voice, but the other, *Psalmos*, a Psalm, was to be used with some musical Instrument, and was so appointed under the Temple-worship, as appears by the Titles of the Psalms.

Now if our Brethren will not understand it according to its prime and proper Signification in the *Hebrew*, which is to praise without singing, but will force upon us the use of Singing in the practice thereof, let them avoid those Arguments that are brought for the use of Organs, Lutes, Harps, or Psalteries, if they can.

But when all this comes to be weighed in the Ballance of the Sanctuary, it will be found too light: For, let's *First* consider, That this was not an Injunction to the Church, how they should behave themselves in their Assemblies, but to such of them only that were merry, and when they were so only. 2. It was only to Psalm, and not to sing Psalms, unless by the use of an Old-Testament-word he will force

force an Old-Testament-practice upon us, and then he brings in the use of musical Instruments also. 3. That seeing Praising is Psalming, without Rhime and Metre, these Christians might be obedient to this Exhortation, if they praised God in their private Capacities, after the best of their skill and knowledge, from the sence of that spiritual Joy they found in their Souls. So that Mr. *Allen*'s first proof fails him; but he is loth to part with it, and therefore saith, it is Objected, This is a Command only to those that are merry.

His Answer is, 'Tis certainly the Duty of 'every Christian to be merry or chearful, or 'of good chear, or (which is the same) to re-'joice in the Lord, whatever be their outward 'condition; and from thence concludes, 'tis his 'Duty to sing Psalms.

There are so many Exceptions against this last Answer, that indeed my time will not permit me to follow him in them all: But I hope some other hand may take him to task thoroughly for such mistaken Assertions. I shall only Note these few things:

1. He makes a time of Mirth and a time of Affliction both one, and even in this place where the Apostle makes such a real Distinction betwixt them.

2. A praying under the sense of Affliction, and a singing for Joy, must be both the same thing; for whatever their outward condition is, 'tis their duty to be merry, and to sing Psalms: But I will follow that part of it no further, because I doubt the Man did not well consider what he said when he wrote it, and I will not aggra-

vate againſt him that advantage he hath put into my Hands, it being obvious to every conſiderate Reader.

But to proceed, I have told him before, that the word Sing is not in this Text, and therefore we might have diſmiſt it, had he not reſolved to ſhew his skill in the *Greek*, upon the word *merry*, which gives me occaſion to examine him a little further.

I perceive my Friend *Allen* doth not think the Tranſlators have rendred the word ευθυμεῖ, *Euthumei*, to the beſt advantage for his cauſe; for inſtead of rendring it *merry*, as they do, he will have it be chearful, or of good chear, or to rejoyce in the Lord.

That it ſignifies to be chearful, or of good chear, he quotes *Acts* 27. 22, 25. but for that other ſignification, which he ſaith is the ſame, *viz.* To rejoice, he cites *Phil.* 4. 4. and 1 *Theſ.* 5. 16. We will now examine theſe Texts; in *Phil.* 4. 4. the *Greek* is, Χαίρετε ἐν Κυρίῳ, *Rejoice in the Lord*, in 1 *Theſ.* 5. 16. it's παντοτε Χαίρετε, *Rejoice evermore:* So that it's not the ſame in either of theſe places, but another word, and of a different ſignification; for in *James* 5. 13. the word is ευθυμεῖ, *Euthumei*, which ſignifies a good and chearful mind, and the other in *Philippians* and *Theſſalonians*, is Χαίρετε, *Chairete*, which ſignifies the act it ſelf of rejoycing.

Well, this poor Man hath loſt all his labour, for he hath not found out the Word *ſing* in the Original, nor proved it a Duty to ſing in Rhime, therefore we will proceed to his next Inſtance.

Another manifeſt Injunction of this Duty we have

have (saith he) from *Paul*, in *Eph.* 5. 19. *Speaking to your selves in Psalms, and Hymns, and spiritual Songs, singing —— to the Lord.*

1. I observe that in setting down the words he leaves out these, *and making melody in your hearts.*

Perhaps the reason was, lest his Readers should suppose, if those words had been inserted, it might only have intended those spiritual revivings they might have had in their Souls, (without singing in Rhime) by the Operations of the Holy Spirit upon them; without expressing their Joy to others by a prelimited stinted form of words, because it's said in the verse foregoing, *Be filled with the spirit, speaking to your selves in Psalms, and Hymns, and Spiritual Songs, singing and making melody in your Hearts to the Lord.*

Besides, this seems to be spoken to them as private Christians, and not as a Church-Ordinance, when assembled together, to be performed with conjoined voices, as many other such private Duties are exhorted to in this Epistle, as you may see in the *4th.* Chapter, *v.* 25, 26, 27, 28. to the end of that Chapter; and in the *5th.* Chapter, and the beginning, he dehorts them from several particular Evils, with the reasons thereof, and the rest of the Chapter is spent chiefly about the Duties Husbands owe to their Wives, and Wives also to their Husbands; and in the *6th.* Chapter he begins with Childrens Duty to their Parents, and Parents to their Children; and so of Servants to their Masters, and of Masters to their Servants: And I hope he will allow, there are divers particu-

lar and relative Duties to be preſſed upon the Members of a Church, which cannot belong to them as a Community, when aſſembled together; And that it is one thing what their work may be in a Perſonal and Family-relation, in reſpect of the Duty required in this Text, and another thing to extend the Exhortation ſo far as to make it a Church-Ordinance, which he can never do from theſe words, becauſe they are exhorted to ſpeak to themſelves, and to ſing, and to make melody in their hearts to the Lord. Not that I ſuppoſe there was no Gift in the Primitive Church for ſinging forth the praiſes of God in their Aſſemblies, for in 1 *Cor.* 14. we have both a Direction and Example; and becauſe it is ſo well expreſt by thoſe eminent Servants of Chriſt, and of his Church, Mr. *Kiffin* and others, in their ſerious Anſwer againſt ſinging in Rhime, with conjoined voices, according to the vulgar practice of it, I ſhall deliver my ſelf in their words: 'We find according to the Direction of our Lord and 'Law-giver, a Pſalm is to be managed after another manner in the Church of Chriſt; for in '1 *Cor.* 14. 26. where it is mentioned plainly 'with reference to the Publick Worſhip of God 'in the Church, it is moſt evident by the con-'text, from *ver.* 24, to 31. that there it is under 'the general regulation of the Gift of Prophecy, 'and the exerciſe thereof limited unto one, as 'farther appears from the 16*th.* and 17*th.* verſes, 'without the leaſt intimation of its being con-'fined or reſtrained to any thing muſical or in 'metre, in the delivery of it.

And as it was performed by any one as a Gift

Gift of the Holy Spirit, (I will sing with the Spirit) so it was delivered for the Edification of the whole, as the Gift of Tongues and other Gifts were in that day, of which we have an Instance in *Acts* 2. 4. *And they were all filled with the Holy Ghost, and began to speak with other Tongues, as the Spirit gave them utterance.*

And whereſoever God ſhall beſtow this Gift upon any one, he will not need their muſical Notes, as Crutches to enable him to expreſs the mind of the Spirit by, for the Edification of the Church.

But as our Brethren believe they may Preach without ſuch an extraordinary Gift, and are to do it according to this General Direction, one by one, ſo I believe we may praiſe God in an acceptable manner, according to the Gifts we have received, one by one, without any ſet form of words.

'But, ſaith he, we find a third Apoſtolical 'Injunction of this Duty in the Epiſtle to the '*Coloſſians*, Chap. 3. 16. where all that are com-'manded to have the *Word of Chriſt dwell richly* '*in them*, are alſo required *To teach and admoniſh* '*one another in Pſalms, Hymns, and Spiritual Songs,* '*and to ſing —— to the Lord.*

Here Mr. *Allen* hath again left out theſe following words, *With Grace in your hearts.* I confeſs it's more ſuitable to their promiſcuous way of ſinging, to have left it out than put in: But we muſt not take away from what is written, leſt we incur the Curſe denounced againſt ſuch that ſo do.

Beſides, I know not of any duty required in the Goſpel, that is acceptable to God, or pro-

fitable to Men, if it be performed without Grace in the Heart.

But seeing Mr. *Allen* hath asserted that it is a moral Duty, enjoined upon all men, of all Nations, and the greatest number of them are without the sanctifying Graces of the Spirit in their Hearts, Christ's flock being but a little flock compared with the rest of the world, he must believe that the greatest part of the world are to sing without Grace in their Hearts, that they are enjoined so to do, and that it is their sin if they do not.

But I had rather assert with the Apostle, That those only are required to do it, who can sing with the Spirit, and have the Word of Christ dwell in them richly in all wisdom, and have Grace in their Hearts to fit and qualifie them for such a spiritual undertaking, than to conclude with Mr. *Allen* that they ought to sing, altho' they want Grace and Wisdom to perform it.

They have therefore contrived a practise very agreable to their Notion, to sing by a stinted and pre-limited form of words, in Rhime and Metre, with conjoined Voices of all the People together, Saints and Sinners, even the most ungracious and prophane, that will but joyn with them in so doing.

Whether this looks like a Gospel-Church-Ordinance, let all sober Christians judge. All the seeming difficulty in this Text to difference it from that in *Eph.* 5. 19. is in these words, *Teaching and admonishing one another.*

If we consider it only thus, as it is in our English Translation, I know no advantage this will

will give them, to countenance their practiſe of ſinging: Becauſe, if they are all Teachers, then there are no Learners, for they all ſing together at once. Had they practiſed it by having one Man ſpeak to them in a Pſalm or Song, and all the reſt had kept Silence at the ſame time, it would have given ſome umbrage to their practice, altho' it had been by a prelimited and ſtinted form of words: For the words are ſometimes uſed in that ſence, they may be ſaid to exhort one another when one ſpeaks at a time, and ſeveral of them take it by turns. But let them ſhew us if they can, that ever ſuch a form of ſpeaking was uſed, when all that were preſent ſpake together, and there were no Hearers.

The words here are διδάσκοντες καὶ νουθετοῦντες ἑαυτούς, *Arias Montanus*, *Docentes & commonentes vosmetipſos*, Teaching and admoniſhing your own ſelves.

The word αὐτος, in the ſingular, ſignifies himſelf; it is a pronoun relative, and being compounded becomes reciprocal, or hath recourſe to the other word with which it is joined, as Φίλαυτος, one that loves himſelf, of Φίλος, a Friend, and ἑαυτος, himſelf; and in 2 *Tim.* 3. 2. in the plural, Φίλαυτοι, *ſeipſos amantes*, which we render, *Men ſhall be lovers of themſelves*, and Φιλαυτία is the *Love of ones ſelf*. And to bring it directly to our preſent purpoſe, Αὐτοδίδακτος, (of διδάσκω, to teach, and ἑαυτὸν, himſelf) one that teacheth himſelf, and as it is here uſed, teaching (and admoniſhing) themſelves. So that it appears to be the true ſcope of the place, that they were to *Teach and admoniſh their own ſelves in Pſalms, and Hymns, and ſpiritual Songs; ſing-*

ing with Grace in their Hearts to the Lord.

I need not add any more, becauſe it's impoſſible for our Singers to prove their practice, or any thing like it, from this Text.

That there is no divine Preſcription for the uſe of artificial Tunes, in ſinging the praiſe of God, Mr. *Allen* doth honeſtly confeſs, in *Chap.* 6. *Sect.* 1. And in juſtifying the lawfulneſs thereof, and for the better clearing of it up, he doth not urge any Text of Scripture, either from the Old or New Teſtament, that it was ever commanded by God, or practiſed by either the Church of the *Jews*, or by the Goſpel-Church in the Apoſtles days: For he muſt needs be conſcious to himſelf there was no inſtance to be given.

But, 2*ly*. He deſires that theſe things may be conſidered.

'1. That we are commanded to do all 'things in the Worſhip of God decently and 'in order.

Let the Reader obſerve by the way, That all the Chriſtian Ceremony-mongers have conſtantly made uſe of this Text by a corrupt Expoſition thereof, to juſtifie all their Innovations in Religion, and Additions to the Worſhip of God, and Mr. *Allen* is now become their Advocate.

2. He ſaith, 'That in many of the External 'Modes and Circumſtances of Divine Worſhip, 'there is no particular preſcription in the 'Word: But Chriſtian Churches are left at li'berty in theſe things, to order them ſo as they 'ſhall judge moſt for Edification.

In anſwer to this, I ſhall *firſt* deny the whole

of

of his Position, and shall demand of him what those things are which are a part of Divine Worship, and yet have no particular Prescription in the Word? 2. How he came to know they are a part of Divine Worship, they not being declared so to be by the Word of God? 3. Who gave the Christian Churches that liberty to bring them into the worship of God, and determine them to be a part of divine worship?

It is (in my Opinion) exceeding dangerous to allow it, having a tendency to root out, change and alter all the external modes of instituted worship, and is that which hath brought the Church of *Rome* (by a long tract of time) to be the Mother of Harlots, and abomination of the Earth, altho' she were in her Original as true a Church as Mr. *Allen*'s.

By Christian Churches I suppose he means every particular individual Church: (For I cannot apprehend how one Church should have a Superiority over another, *de Jure*,) and then we may quickly have as many different modes of worship as there are Churches, and yet all pretend to act by virtue of Christ's Authority, and this will not argue their being guided by one and the same Spirit.

In the 3*d*. place he is pleased to condescend so far, as to pretend to explain this, but that Explanation is scarcely free from a Contradiction. I am sorry the man hath espoused so bad a Cause, that he must be forced to be self-condemned.

For he saith, 'This Liberty, as I conceive, 'does not authorize any number of men in a

'Christian

'Christian Church, to prescribe Rites and Ex-
'ternal Modes of divine worship according to
'their own Judgments, and impose them upon
'all others in their Communion; but these things
'ought to be ordered by the mutual Agreement
'of at least the *Major* part of the several Mem-
'bers of it.

How he will reconcile the former part to the latter, I know not; unless in his Conception the *Major* part of the Church are not included in these words, *Any number of Men*: I hope he is not for making the Women sole Judges in this matter.

I would therefore desire him to answer me a few Questions.

1. Whether by Churches he doth not intend the Brethren in each Church that have the power of Discipline?

2. Whether there be not some of them particularly appointed as helps in Government, with power to act in all affairs relating to the Discipline of the Church? and whether seven of those are not a *Coram?*

3. Whether this be not the present form of Government exercised in Mr. *Allen*'s Congregation?

4. Whether four of these seven, upon any difference arising, have not power to determine the matter, they being the *major* part?

5. Whether if any Rites or external Modes of divine worship be determined by them as most fit for Edification, they have not a power to impose them upon all others in their Communion?

I suppose it agreeable to his own Position, be-

because he saith, these things ought to be ordered by the mutual agreement of at least the *major* part of the several members of it: And if he shall extend the power of Discipline further, yet it must terminate in the *major* part of all the Brethren at a Church-meeting.

But how doth Mr. *Allen* prove this?

Why, he tells us in the *fourth* place, 'That 'tis the duty of all the Members of a Religious Assembly to sing the Praises of God, and 'that with conjoined Voices. I perceive one Error being granted, more will follow after, for upon this he infers, 'It is necessary, to the 'end that this may be done decently and in 'order, that some general rule should be agreed 'upon, according to which each may so order 'their voice, as that the whole Assembly may sing 'harmoniously and without confusion. It seems he is conscious to himself there is none of this appointed by Christ, he hath took no care to prevent Confusion in his Church about singing, but hath left the matter to be determined by Mr. *Allen*, and the major part of his Congregation, as they in their great wisdoms shall think fit.

But what is this general Rule that they have agreed upon?

His answer is, 'Now such a general Rule 'is, that which is usually called a Tune, which 'therefore is necessary to the orderly performance of this duty.

But how can a Tune be a general Rule? he ought to explain himself in his next.

But pray Observe, *First*, He tells us 'tis the Churches liberty so to do; then if they had not done it, they had not sinned, and then the omit-

omitting to sing the Praises of God with a tunable Voice had been no sin, if their determination had not made it so.

But, 2*ly*. 'He tells us, that such singing is necessary.

Either it was necessary before the Church appointed it, or their appointment made it so. If it was necessary in it self, previous to that appointment, then there were some reasons grounded upon Scripture to make it necessary before that appointment was made; and then I hope they are able to produce them, that we may judge of their validity as well as themselves.

But if their simple appointment thereof, and agreement thereto, makes their singing with a tunable Voice necessary, and a part of divine worship, I hope those that did never concern themselves in that agreement, except to oppose it, are not under any obligation so to sing.

For, granting things enjoined, antecedently to their Injunction, to be indifferent in their own nature, and at the Churches liberty, and then afterwards to give reasons taken from themselves, as from their decency and order, their conduciveness to Edification, their tendency to the encrease of Devotion, their significancy of this or that, is to speak amazing contradictions.

And to make things necessary by an agreement of the *major* part of the Church, not enjoined by the Word of God, is an act purely of Power: And so far as it is affirmed to be a part of divine Worship, it is an Invasion upon the Regal Authority of the Son of God.

Is not this the very Argument that all the

Usur

Usurpers in the World, both Princes and Priests, have alledged, for imposing their Humane Inventions upon the Consciences of men about divine worship? And will Mr. *Allen* (who hath dissented from them about the external modes of some parts of instituted worship) take upon him to justifie those Men in their so doing? Surely his Brethren have cause to take it ill at his hands: For he that builds again the things he hath destroyed, makes himself a Transgressor.

And I pray consider, All our Obedience in the Worship of God is the Obedience of Faith; and if the Scripture be the Rule of Faith, our Faith is not in any of its concerns to be extended beyond it, no more than the thing to be regulated is to be extended beyond its Rule.

The Famous *Basil* could say, Φανερα ἐκπτωσις, καὶ ὑπερηφανίας κατηγορία, &c. It hath the manifest guilt of Infidelity and Pride to reject any thing that is written, or to add or introduce any thing that is not written. And this is the summ of all we contend for.

And in his Epistle 80. *ad Eustath.* he rejects all pretences of Customs and Usages of any sort of Men, and will have all differences to be determined by the Holy Scripture.

Chrysostom in his Homily on *Psalm* 95. speaks after the same manner: Who is this that promises these things? He answers, *Paul:* For we are not to say any thing without Testimony, or upon our meer reasonings: For if any thing be spoken without Scripture-testimony, the minds of the hearers fluctuate, now assenting, anon hesitating; sometimes rejecting what is spoken as

trivi-

frivilous, sometimes receiving it as probable: But where the testimony of the Divine Voice comes forth from the Scripture, it confirmeth the Word of the Speaker, and the mind of the Hearer.

The same Author, as in many other places, so in his 13*th*. Homily, on the second Epistle to the *Corinthians*, expresly sends us to the Scriptures to determine all things, as being the exact and perfect Canon, Balance and Rule of Religion.

Hierom also saith, *Quod de Scripturis Authoritatem non habet, eadem facilitate contemnitur, quâ probatur*; Whatsoever hath not the Authority of Scripture, may as easily be contemned as approved.

Among the *Latin* Fathers *Tertullian* is expres to the same purpose, for in his Book against *Hermogenes*, he saith, *Adoro plenitudinem Scripturæ, quâ mihi factorem*, &c. *I adore the fulness of the Scripture*, and let *Hermogenes* prove what he saith to be written, or fear the Woe denounced against them who add to, or take from the Word of God.

And in his Book *De carne Christi*; *Non recipio quod extra Scripturam de tuo infers*; *I do not receive what you bring of your own, without Scripture.*

Also in his Book *De prescriptionibus*: *Nobis nihil ex nostro arbitrio indulgere licet, sed nec eligere quod aliquis de arbitrio suo induxerit, Apostolos Domini habemus Authores*, &c. *It is not lawful for us* (in these things) *to indulge our own wills, nor to choose what is brought in by the will of another; we have the Apostles of our Lord for our Example*, who brought in nothing of their own minds

or

or choice, but what they had received from Christ, they faithfully communicated to the Nations. And this must needs be a great truth, because Christ is the only Law-giver to his Church; God hath appointed him to be Head over *all things* to the Church: All power is given to him as Mediator in Heaven and Earth, we are to hear him in all things whatsoever he hath said; *His sheep hear his voice, and a stranger they will not follow, for they know not the voice of strangers*: We are to contend for that Faith (and no other) which was *once* delivered to the Saints, not what hath been since brought in by humane Invention, under the pretence of Decency and Order; for we are not to add to his Words, lest he reprove us, and we be found Liars.

It was the high Commendation of the Church at *Corinth*, That they kept the Ordinances, as *Paul* had delivered them, and that they followed him therein, as he followed Christ, and we are to walk so, as we have them for an Example. Away therefore with all this pretence of Decency and Order, where we have neither command nor Example for our Guide, as there is none in all the Holy Scripture for this mode of singing which they have set up.

But I hope it is not yet so bad with them as it was with that Enemy of the Christian Religion, *Samuel Parker*, D. D. and late Bishop of *Oxford*, to say as he doth in his *Eccl. Polity*, *pag.* 178. 'That all the pious Villanies that ever 'have disturbed the Christian World, have 'sheltered themselves in this grand Maxime, that 'Jesus Christ is the only Law-maker to his 'Church. And also opposes the Maxime it self.

But

But however, they may (if the Grace of God do not prevent) come in time to be of his mind: For I perceive, they do not own that Christ hath made sufficient provision for his Church, by Laws of his own making, but hath left the modes of Worship to the discretion of the *major* part of Mr. *Allen*'s Congregation, to be done decently and in order, according to their agreement. And if Mr. *Allen*, or any of his five Champions, will oppose the Maxime it self, (as all Will-worshippers are forced to do) I am of Opinion, whatever apprehensions they may have of their own Abilities, they are no way competent to disprove this Foundation-principle of the Gospel.

It's true, all political worldly Government consists in the exercise of Principles of Natural Right, and their just application to Times, Ages, Persons, and Occasional Occurrences, wherein Mens Ease and Profit (not their Consciences) are concerned. But in the Worship of God things are quite otherwise, for they have a regard to the pleasing of God, and to Man's Eternal Felicity.

The former indeed, as they respect Civil Government, are liable to alterations, according to the various circumstances of Persons, Times and Places.

But the matters of divine instituted worship being spiritual, and depending only upon the will of the Law-giver, and his Acceptation of the Persons and Services of the Worshippers, are not capable of any humane Variation whatsoever: They have no respect to Climates, Customs, Forms of civil Government, or any other

other thing of the like nature: For the worſhip of God under the Goſpel is (and ought to be) the ſame at all times, in all places, amongſt all People, in all Nations: And the order of it is fix'd and determined in all particulars that belong unto it.

And let not any (eſpecially our Brethren) pretend the contrary, who have ſeparated from other Churches for their Innovations in matters of worſhip, until they can give an inſtance of any ſuch defect in the Inſtitutions of Chriſt, as that the worſhip of God cannot be carried on, nor his Church governed and edified, without an addition of ſomething of their own for the Supply thereof, which therefore ſhould and would be neceſſary to that end, antecedent unto its addition: And when they have ſo done, I will ſubſcribe to their mode of ſinging, or any other thing they ſhall ſo add.

I can ſcarcely ſatisfie my ſelf without proſecuting this to its utmoſt limits, becauſe I ſee the Declenſion that is in our day requires it, but my leiſure will not permit me at this time.

One thing more I ſhould ſpeak to, before I cloſe theſe Animadverſions; and that is, to anſwer thoſe ſilly Reflections which Mr. *Allen* makes upon ſome of the Queries, about the uſe of the Verb ὑμνέω, and its derivatives, that it doth not only ſignifie to praiſe, but alſo to lament.

I ſhall therefore repeat the two Queries,

Qu. 6. Whether the term ὑμνήσαντες, *hymneſantes*, doth not as ſtrongly imply that they lamented, as that they ſung and rejoiced?

Q. 7. Whe-

Qu. 7. Whether there is not a greater probability, that they mourned or lamented, than that they ſung and rejoiced at that time?

But Mr. *Allen* ſaith, 'This is ignorantly (to 'ſay no worſe) intimated by a late Queriſt.

This man ſeems to have a great Opinion of his own (late) acquired Knowledge, that at every turn he muſt be upbraiding others for their Ignorance, I hope all the World are not ignorant beſides himſelf.

I will prove that (in this point) the ignorance (not to ſay worſe) lies at his own door.

For the Learned *Leigh*, in his *Critica ſacra*, ſaith, *Verbum ὑμνεῖν, Non ſolum laudes dicere ſignificat, ſed etiam conqueri*; The verb *hymnein* doth not not only ſignifie to ſpeak Praiſes, but alſo *conqueri*, viz. *to lament, to complain, to make moan*, as that word ſignifies; and *conqueſtio* and *conqueſtus* is *a complaining, lamenting*, or *crying out*, as uſed by *Livey* and others, and is well known to the Learned to be uſed in that ſence.

Alſo Mr. *Alexander Rowley*, in his Συνεργὸς τοῖς Μαθηταῖς, tells us, the word ὑμνέω, *hymneo*, ſignifies *conqueror*, viz. *complain, make moan, lament.*

Likewiſe Mr. *Keach*'s Learned Hand, at the end of his *Breach Repaired*, when he hath recited Mr. *Marlow*'s words, that *hymno* ſignified *conqueror*, to complain, and that *hymnein* was put for *lamentari*, to lament, which he cites out of *Conſtatice*'s *Greek Lexicon*, he ſaith, this I readily allow, and (if I am not miſinformed) this is Mr. *William Collins*, one of his five Learned Champions, who have ſet their hands in commendation of Mr. *Allen*'s Book.

I

I could cite many other Teſtimonies, if there were occaſion; but theſe are ſufficient to curb his Inſolency againſt the Queriſt, and to prove that he only, and not the Queriſt, is an *Ignoramus*.

But (ſaith he) I have ſearched all the places where this word is uſed by the *Seventy*, and can find nothing in them for this Suggeſtion.

This ſeems to be done on purpoſe to make his Reader believe the Queriſt had directed him to the Seventy for his Authority, whereas he ſaith not one word about them, therefore (rather than want buſineſs) he hath ſet up a man of ſtraw of his own to fence againſt.

But I wonder how he dares affirm, that he hath ſearched all the places where it's uſed by the Seventy, when the Learned *Weemſe*, in his Chriſtian Synagogue, ſaith, 'This Tranſlation of the '*Seventy* periſhed when the Library of *Ptolemy* 'was burnt by *Pompey*, therefore they are but 'fragments of it which we have now.

Beſides, the *Seventy* were not θεοπνεῦσται, divinely inſpired, and therefore might err as well as others. It is recorded of them, that they purpoſely changed ſome places, for fear of giving offence to *Ptolemy* and his Queen.

As they do not tranſlate the *Hebrew* word by λαγὼν, a Hare, but δασυπόδα, rough foot; becauſe the Queen was called *Arnbath*, a Hare, leſt ſhe ſhould ſuppoſe they mocked her, *Levit.* 11. 6.

And in *Deut.* 32. 8. where they ſhould have rendred it the Children of *Iſrael*, they tranſlated it Angels of God, leaſt the Heathen ſhould be offended with *Iſrael*'s being equalled with the reſt

of the World; thirteen such places they thus translate, as *Josippus* and the *Talmud* testifie.

They have likewise added a hundred years to the Lives of each of the Fathers mentioned in *Gen.* 5. that they might seem to match the Fabulous *Egyptians* in the number of their years; and they added three or four verses at the end of *Job*, which are not originally set down in the *Hebrew*.

And as I would not take that for a good testimony which is not, so on the other hand I would not reject any thing that deserves commendation in its due place.

That which is *Authenticæ Veritatis*, is the *Hebrew* of the Old Testament; and the Translation of the *Seventy* is only *Ecclesiasticæ universalis receptæ*, where the first cannot be come at, but not esteemed of equal Authority with the *Hebrew*.

Moreover, to return to Mr. *Allen*, he doth give his Concession, that it may have been used in that sense, even by *Greek* Authors: For he saith, 'And tho' any Instance should be found 'in prophane Writers of its being thus used 'by way of Antithesis, (I shall leave him to be corrected by another hand for the improper use of that word) yet, saith he, 'I think it 'would be very unreasonale to take it in such 'a strained sense in the Scripture.

It is not the first time Mr. *Allen* hath been mistaken in his thoughts: For, must we suppose that none of the Learned *Greeks* understood the true *Etimology* of their own Native Language, besides the Pen-men of the New Testament.

And

And 2*ly*. I will ſuppoſe they underſtood their own Native Language better than Mr. *Allen* is capable to do; and knowing the Cuſtoms of their own Countrey, were better fitted to adapt *Greek* words to thoſe things they treated of than one of another Countrey, and ſo far remote both as to Place and Time.

3*ly*. After all this noiſe about the *Seventy*, the Queſtion is not how it was uſed by them in their tranſlation of the Old Teſtament, but how it is uſed by *Matthew* and *Mark*, in thoſe two places the Queriſt refers to? ſo much for the ſixth Query.

Qu. 7. Whether there is not a greater probability that they mourned or lamented, than that they ſung and rejoiced at that time?

I ſhall eſſay to make that good, from the preſent ſtate the Apoſtles were in, and the Circumſtances that attended them at that time.

1. From the ſence they had upon them that their Lord and Maſter was to be betray'd and crucify'd, which muſt needs be a very afflicting conſideration, *Mat*. 26. 21, 22. *And as they did eat, he ſaid, verily, I ſay unto you, that one of you ſhall betray me; and they were exceeding ſorrowful, and began every one of them to ſay unto him, Lord, is it I?* the like account you have in that Parralel Place, *Mark* 14. 19. *They began to be ſorrowful*; and in *John* 13. which appears (by comparing it with the former) to be at the ſame time, both by *Judas*'s betraying him, and the other concurring circumſtances, we find they were ſo filled with ſorrow, that our Saviour obſerving, forbears to proceed any further, before he had uſed means to comfort them, *John*.

14. 1. *Let not your heart be troubled:* And again, in ver. 27. *Let not your heart be troubled, neither let it be afraid*; and in *Chap.* 15. 19, 20, 21. when he had told them how they should be hated and persecuted by the world, as also in *Chap.* 16. and the beginning, he doth again observe how greatly they were afflicted thereat, and therefore saith to them in *ver.* 6. *Because I have said these things unto you, sorrow hath filled your hearts:* And in *v.* 22. *And ye now therefore have sorrow*; and in *Chap.* 18. 1. *When Jesus had spoken these words, he went forth with his Disciples over the Brook Cedron, where was a Garden, into the which he entred, and his Disciples, and Judas came with a band of Officers, who seiz'd him, bound him, and led him away*; as you may see more at large in that Chapter.

If it should be supposed, that our Saviour's words had taken off this Grief and Sorrow before he instituted his last Supper, as the contrary is evident from the place it self, so it is also manifest that it remained upon them after they were in the Garden, by the concurrent testimony of the several Evangelists to this matter, *Mat.* 26. 43. *Their eyes were heavy:* And the same account in *Mark* 14. 40. And most expresly by the Evangelist *Luke*, Chap. 22. 45. *And when he was come to his Disciples, he found them sleeping for sorrow.*

From all which it's evident, that the Querist's Suggestion, that it was more probable that they mourned or lamented, rather than rejoiced at that time, was not the effect of Ignorance, or worse, but from a Solid Judgment, grounded upon the word of God: And that it was Mr.

Allen's

Allen's Ignorance (not to say worse) that made him ridicule the Querist, (altho' an ancient Member of his own Church, and one that hath been both a Deacon and an Elder in time past) and speak so diminutively of him as he hath done in divers places of his Book.

But Mr. *Allen* is not satisfied with this, but makes a further remark upon it, and gives it this fine name of a Fancy.

His words are these, 'I shall therefore dis-'miss this Fancy with only Noting, That should 'this new Interpretation be admitted, then 'where 'tis said, *Paul* and *Silas sang praises to* 'God, *and the prisoners heard them*, the meaning 'would be, *they lamented so loud, that the prisoners* 'heard them.

I answer, 1. By letting him know, there are many words in Scripture used in a very different signification.

As for instance, the word בָּרַךְ, *barach*, is rendred, *he blessed*, in many places in the Old Testament; and in other places when it is spoken of Cursing God, it being accounted by the *Hebrews* so horrid, they will not express it by a proper word of cursing, but put *bless* for it; as in the case of the false witnesses against *Naboth*, 1 Kings 21. 10, 13. the words are, *Thou didst bless God and the King*; and in *v.* 13. *Naboth did bless God and the King*: Now in this place it must be understood *to curse*, and therefore our Translators have rendred it according to the true Scope, *Blaspheme God and the King*. In *Job* 2. 5. the word is *barach*, *he blessed*, but it's thus translated, *He will curse thee to thy face*; and in *v.* 9. it's the same word, and yet it's rendred *Curse God and dye*.

Again, the word לֶחֶם, *lechem*, signifies to *eat bread*, and yet it's sometimes rendred (and that rightly) *to wage war*; and they give this as a reason for such a use of the word, that War devours Men, as Men devour Bread.

Also רוּחַ, *ruach*, signifies *spirit*, *breath or wind*, it's sometimes put for the Holy Spirit, sometimes for the Soul of man, sometimes for the breath inspirid and exspired by a living Animal, and at other times for the wind it self.

Besides these, there is an instance in the case depending, which had he been skilled in the controversie, he might have understood.

For the word הָלַל, *halal*, in the conjugation *kal*, signifies he was mad, but in the 3*d*. conj. it is הִלֵּל, *hillel*, *he praised*; and hence *tehillah*, praise, or praising, a Psalm, and in the *pl. masc. tehillim*, praises, from whence that Book hath its name, *Sepher tehilim*, the Book of Praises.

Now I pray observe Mr. *Allen*'s Logick.

If there be a word of a different or contrary signification, it must be used in one of those senses only; for he tells us, that if we will understand it so in *Mat*. 26. 30. and *Mark* 14. 26. that they lamented, then we must understand it so in every other place where it's used, or else else his Argument is a *Non-sequitor*, for he saith we must use it so in *Acts* 16. 25. without assigning any other reason.

We will therefore try it in these few Instances:

1. If *Barach*, he blessed, because it's sometimes put for Cursing, should always be used in that sense, where-ever it occurs, then in all places where the Prophet *David* saith, *Bless the Lord*,

O my Soul, it must be meant, *Curse the Lord, O my Soul!* And where he saith, *Bless the Lord, all ye his Saints*, it must be intended, he exhorted them to Curse him: And then what fine work would he make of interpreting Scripture; but these things are easily understood by the scope of those places where the word is used.

2. Because *Lechem* is sometimes put for War as well as for Bread, by Mr. *Allen*'s Rule whereever Bread is intended we must call it War.

3. Because *Ruach* is sometimes put for Breath, doth he think it good Logick to assert, that where-ever the Soul of Man is intended thereby, it is nothing else but his Breath? or, because it doth sometimes signifie the Wind, therefore when it's put for the Divine Spirit, it's the Wind only that is intended? But this is his way of arguing.

4. Because the word *Halal* in the first conjugation signifies *he was mad*, that where-ever we meet with it as used in the third conjugation, which signifies *he praised*, &c. and find it written, *they praised*, or *sung praises*, must we from thence conclude that all that did so were mad? I do not think Mr. *Allen* will allow of such an Interpretation.

I shall therefore dismiss this *Fancy* in the words of Mr. *Keach*'s learned hand, in his Answer to Mr. *Marlow*'s Appendix.

As to what Mr. *Marlow* saith of the use of the word ὑμνεω, *hymneo*, to reproach, to accuse, to complain, *&c.* I readily allow —— But the use of the words to these ends doth not at all prejudice its primary signification, which is certainly true.

So

So that you may see, if Mr. *Allen* had but read what this Gentleman had written five Years agoe, he might have saved himself and me all this trouble.

But he proceeds to tell us, It is Objected, That had this Hymn belonged to the Lord's Supper, doubtless the Apostle would have mentioned it, when he sets down the Institution of this Ordinance, as he had received it from the Lord, 1 *Cor.* 11. 23, *&c.*

To this he replies, That were there any force in this Objection, we might also thence conclude, that giving thanks before the Cup doth not belong to it; of which, tho' it be plainly expreſt by the Evangelist, yet the Apostle makes no mention.

This is a bold stroke, I could not but admire at this Assertion; for if he had but read the place cited by himself, he might have been satisfied he was in an Error: I will therefore set down the words at length.

1 Cor 11. 23, 24, 25. *For I have received of the Lord that which also I delivered unto you,* (I hope he doth not think the Apostle was going to tell them a Lye) *That the Lord Jesus, the same night in which he was betrayed, took bread; and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, Eat, this is my body, which is broken for you; this do in remembrance of me: After the same manner also he took the Cup, when he had supped, saying, This Cup is the New Testament in my Blood, this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.*

I pray observe how this Institution is laid down.

1. Saith the Apostle, *He took Bread.*

2. That

2. That before he brake it, *he gave thanks.*

And touching the Cup, he thus expreſſes it; *After the ſame manner alſo he took the Cup:* And in *Chap.* 10. 16. *The Cup of Bleſſing which we bleſs.*

Now I muſt confeſs, if the Apoſtle had not told us, that Chriſt gave thanks before he broke the Bread, there had been ſome umbrage for this pretence; but when the Apoſtle ſaith expreſly, *After the ſame manner alſo he took the Cup*; it muſt be to denote that he gave thanks before he gave it to them, or elſe the words are neither Senſe nor Grammar.

I conclude therefore, (to uſe his own Rhetorick) It's a bold and confident aſſertion, contrary to truth, and to the plain meaning and ſcope of the place: And how his five Champions come to be guilty of ſuch an over-ſight, I know not, unleſs they ſet their Hands to a Book they had never read.

I conclude again therefore, That this Hymn might belong to the Paſſover, and ceaſe with it, not being mentioned in any of the Apoſtolick Writings, as practiſed by any Church of Chriſt in thoſe dayes. And alſo, becauſe Mr. *Allen* himſelf doth confeſs there was a Hymn belonging to the Paſſover, altho' he thinks that both that and the Supper were included in it at that time, and that it was performed at leaſt eſpecially (they are his own words) upon the occaſion of his own Supper, but doth not give us any one inſtance that our Lord Jeſus did ever ſing, either at that or any other time.

There is one thing I had like to have forgot, That Mr. *Allen* doth ſo ſlightly paſs over that Objection, without giving it its due weight, *viz.*

They

That by the same Rule they bring into the Church a prelimited and set Form of singing in Rhime, they may also introduce a set Form of Prayer.

I do aver, There is more to be said for such a Form of Prayer than for their Form of Singing.

First, Because we have Forms of Prayer expressly set down in the New Testament, as in *Mat.* 6. 9. *John* 17. *Acts* 4. 24, &c.

But we have no mention of any Song or Psalm translated into Rhyme in all the New Testament, or any instance of any of those Primitive and Apostolick Churches that ever sung as our Brethren do.

Secondly, I would fain know, how they will prove that any part of the Book of Psalms, much less the whole, were translated into Greek, or any vulgar Language, in the Apostle's days, into Rhime and Metre, as they now practise it.

Thirdly, If they cannot prove it, then all those Churches were under an utter impossibility of singing them in Rhime, as they now do, altho' they tell us 'tis a moral duty, and so the duty of all the men in the World.

Fourthly, This Consideration alone renders all they have said for their practise doubtful, until they have proved it, and till then we shall forbear to practise it.

Postscript.

Postscript.

SInce I had finished my Animadversions, I have met with this Objection from a man of no mean Estimation; That whereas Mr. *Allen* saith, in *p.* 5. *Chap.* 1. 'That *singing* the Praises of 'God is a *Christian* Duty, from its being a '*moral* Duty: He doth not believe that he intends thereby *singing* in *Rhime*, with *conjoined* voices of *all* the People together, as they *now* practice it in *their* Assemblies.

Having therefore some few *spare* pages, I thought good to return this Answer thereunto.

Either he *intends* their way of *singing* to be a *moral* Duty, or he doth *not*; if he *doth*, I have took him *fairly*, if he doth *not*, then it's *nothing* to his purpose.

For if there should be any *other mode* of *singing* a moral duty, it doth *not* in the least prove *theirs* to be so; his Business was to prove *their own practice* to be a *moral* Duty, for every man is to prove his own work, *Gal.* 6. 4. and unless he intended so to do, he hath blotted innocent Paper to *no purpose*.

There is no reason to blame me for taking his words in the *most favourable* acception; especially when in his Epistle he saith, 'What is 'wanting in one place he hath endeavoured to 'supply in another: It being also his *design* in *that part* of his Book to prove *their* practice to be a *Christian* Duty, because it's a *moral* Duty, and consequently the Duty of *all* men; not *only* to *speak*, but also to *sing* his praise; see *pag.* 8,

9. of his Book, and in the *Contents* of that Chapter he hath these very words, 'Proving singing of Psalms a *Christian* Duty from its *morality*: So that he must intend *that* or *nothing*, for it's the only *medium* he makes use of (in that place) to prove it to be a *Christian* Duty.

If therefore our Brethren will stand by *this position* of theirs, and prove *their practice* to be a *moral* Duty, taught by the *light within*, or a *positive* Duty, taught by the *light* of Scripture, I will be satisfied.

For, I would have *all men* know, I do not *contend* with my Brethren (whom I love and honour) *without cause*, but I do it for the *sake* of truth, and to prevent a *gradual* Apostacy in *matters* of *Worship*; for they have already brought in this *humane Invention of singing* into the *Church*, and joined it with the *worship* of God, and where they will *fix* their *Standard*, as yet we know not, but we have reason to believe they will proceed *further*: Because they have told us in Mr. *Allen*'s Book, *Chap.* 6. *pag.* 89. 'That in 'many of the External *Modes* and Circumstances 'of *Divine Worship* there is no *particular pre-* 'scription in the *Word*; but *Christian* Churches 'are left at *Liberty* in *these* things, to order 'them so as they shall judge most for *Edification*. But *this* I have sufficiently animadverted upon in *pag.* 55. *&c.* to which I refer you.

I shall *close* all with a brief enquiry into the *Nature* of *those Songs* mentioned in the *New Testament*, and in what *manner* it is recorded that the *most eminent* Servants of God, even the *Son* himself, did offer up *their Praises* to him.

Those *Songs* I shall (at present) take Notice of,

of, that are recorded in the *New Testament*, you may find in *Rev.* 5. 9, 10. *Chap.* 15. 3, 4. both which I shall take notice of. As for that in *Rev.* 14. 3. It's indeed called a *New Song*, but the *matter* of it is not recorded, and therefore I shall pass it by. *Rev.* 5. 9, 10. *And they sung a New Song*, saying, *Thou art worthy to take the book, and to open the Seals thereof; for thou wast slain, and hast redeemed us to God by thy blood, out of every kindred, and tongue, and people, and Nation; and hast made us unto our God Kings and Priests, and we shall reign on the Earth.* Rev. 15. 3, 4. *And they sang the Song of Moses, the Servant of God, and the Song of the Lamb*, saying, *Great and Marvellous are thy works, Lord God Almighty; Just and true are thy ways, thou King of Saints. Who shall not fear thee, O Lord, and glorifie thy Name, for thou only art holy; for all Nations shall come and worship before thee, for thy Judgments are made manifest.*

Here are several things to be observed:

1. That *these* are called *Songs*.

2. That the *matter* of them are *Praises* to *God*, and to the *Lamb*.

3. That they are in *Prose*, and not in *Rhime*, and yet called *Songs*.

4. We may from *hence* infer, that such a *Mode* of *praising* God is a *singing* of his *Praise* in a *true* and *proper* sense, or else these could not be called *Songs*.

5. It is therefore *most evident*, that when we *praise* God in *Prose*, after the best manner we can, it's as *acceptable* a Sacrifice to God as the best *Musical Notes* in the World.

Besides, If our Brethren will please to consider, there are many *Forms* of *praising* God, by some of his most *eminent Servants*, yea, by the *Son* himself,

ſelf, recorded in the *New Teſtament*, which are *written* for our Inſtruction, tho' *not* to oblige us to expreſs our ſelves in thoſe *very* words: And yet there is *not one* Example among them of their *praiſing* God in *Rhime*, as our Brethren do

I ſhall give you ſome *few* Inſtances, deſiring you would *read* at *length* all thoſe following *quotations*. *Luk.* 1. 41, 42, 43, 44, 45. *And Elizabeth was filled with the Holy Ghoſt, and ſhe ſpake out with a loud voice, and ſaid*, &c. Alſo *Luk.* 1. from *ver.* 46, to ver 55. *And Mary ſaid, my ſoul doth magnifie the Lord*, &c. *Zachariah* the Prieſt, *Luke* 1. 67, &c. *being filled with the Holy Ghoſt, propheſied, ſaying, Bleſſed be the Lord God of Iſrael*, &c. Here was the high praiſes of God in his mouth joined with Propheſie.

It is left upon record, how the Lord Jeſus *gave thanks* to his Father, *Mat.* 11. 25, 26. *Luke* 10. 21. *In that hour Jeſus rejoiced in ſpirit, and ſaid, I thank thee, O Father, Lord of Heaven and Earth*, &c.

And in *Acts* 4. 24, *&c.* we have an account of the *Apoſtles* and *their* Company *lifting* up their *voice* to God, both in *praiſing* of him, and *praying* to him at the ſame time, which may ſerve as an *Example* to *us*, to mix our *Praiſes* to God with the *prayers* we make unto him, according to that Exhortation, 1 *Tim.* 2. 1. Thus you ſee that in *all* theſe places there is uſed neither *Rhime* nor *Metre*, but a *praiſing* God in *Proſe*, which met with the *higheſt acceptation* from him, through the *Interceſſion of Chriſt*. And I hope our Brethren for the time to come, will be pleaſed to follow ſuch Praiſe-worthy Examples.

FINIS.

AN EPISTLE Concerning BAPTISM.

Occasionally written upon the sight of two Treatises published by

Mr. *THOMAS JAMES*,

Teacher of a Presbyterian Congregation at *Ashford* in *Kent*: Who hath reflected upon the Baptized Christians.

By *WILLIAM RUSSEL*, Medicinæ Doctor, Academiæ Cantabrigiensis,
A Lover of Primitive Christianity.

Ask for the old Paths, where is the good Way, and walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your Souls, Jer. 6. 16.

London, Printed in the Year 1696.

To those Inhabitants of Ashford, *and the adjacent Parishes, who attend upon the Ministry of Mr.* Thomas James.

THE Occasion of my writing this Epistle to you at this time, ariseth from the Consideration of two Books written by *T. J.* The one intituled, *Spira's Despair revived.* The other called, *A Vindication of that Part of it which is challenged by the Anabaptists*, &c. which is a pretended Answer to a Book written by *J. W.* in Answer to his first Book, *&c.* the latter of which he dedicates to you.

In which Book he brings you in as Parties with him, in confederacy against that People; as making you to have an equal, if not a greater Interest than him, in that Paper-War he hath raised against them.

And seeing it hath pleased God (by his good Providence) to put it into the Hearts of our King, and both Houses of Parliament, to give us the free Exercise of our Religion by Law, (which we esteem as a great Mercy) it was a wonder to me to read such scurrilous and reproachful Language, against those of our Perswasion; and the more, for that it proceeds from one who is himself a Dissenter from the established Religion of the Land, and a Teacher of a Presbyterian Congregation. And to find him publishing to the World, that the Inhabitants of *Ashford*, and divers other Parishes, did join issue with him in so doing; it seems to bespeak but little Sense of the Goodness of God, and of our Rulers, in the Liberty you enjoy.

Now whereas those Ministers that are of the Episcopal Perswasion, do give us civil Treatment, and do not concern themselves to disturb our Peace and Quiet, much less to reproach and abuse us: I was considering what should

move Mr. *Thomas James* to act as he hath done: And at last I concluded it must certainly proceed from that very Spirit and Principle of the first Founder of your Sect, Mr. *John Calvin*, who burnt the Books of *Servetus*, a Learned *Baptist*; and afterwards perswaded the Magistrates of *Geneva* to burn him alive. Which Sentence was executed upon him, as *Castellio* testifies (who was a Contemporary with him) in these words; Michael Servetus *was burnt alive for his Opinion, at* Geneva, *Anno* 1553, *upon the* 27*th day of* October.

And yet, as one well observes, Mr. *Calvin* did acknowledg this of him, That he was a Learned and a Charitable Man.

Notwithstanding this, he wrote a Book to justify their putting him to death, as a Man whose Books were full of Errors. Which Book was sufficiently confuted by the Learned *Castellio*; where he also shews that the Reason why *Calvin* procured his Death, was this, lest the excellent Parts and Learning of *Servetus* should have eclipsed the Glory of *Calvin*, and prevented him from being the Head of a Party. And yet *Castellio* was not a *Baptist*.

Now if Mr. *James* should have imbibed the same persecuting Principles, it is no wonder to find so much Rancour of Spirit appear in him against the *Baptists* in our Days, as he hath expressed in these two Treatises. I speak not this, as if I meant to accuse the whole Party; for I know that divers of them are meliorated, and have manifested themselves to be Men of better and more peaceable Principles. But seeing there are some young Men of another mind, I thought it not amiss to give you a Caution against it, remembring what an honest old Presbyterian Minister said once to some others of his Brethren, who met to ordain three young Ministers who had declared themselves for this persecuting Principle; saith he, "I "will have no hand in their Ordination, for there are "Firebrands enough in the World already; and (if it "please God) I will have no hand in sending more, for "such as they are enough to set the World in a Flame "where-ever they come.

And I fear your young Man may be of that number. I pray let me ask you a few civil Questions; which I desire you to propound to him, and do you demand of him particular and distinct Answers thereunto. 1. Whe-

1. Whether Mr. *James* doth not believe the Episcopal Church of *England* to be a true Church? and their Teachers to be true Ministers?

2. Whether he doth not own their Baptism and Ordination to be true and valid?

3. Whether he doth not think it lawful for you to go to their publick Worship, and attend upon their Ministry in their Parochial Assemblies; rather than suffer Imprisonment, and the loss of your Estates? And if this be so,

Then, 4. what can be the Motive to excite *Thomas James* to keep up a Separation from the established Church of *England*, now in a Time of Peace? unless it be to get a better livelihood for himself, than he could otherwise obtain.

5. Whether the fear of losing some of his Auditors, or being hindred from an increase of their Number, by which his Income might be diminished, might not be the great Motive which excited him to such a foolish way of scribling against the *Baptists?*

6. Whether it doth not therefore highly concern you, to make a diligent Enquiry into the Word of God, and examine his Doctrines thereby, that you may see whether they agree with the Doctrine and Practice of the Apostles and Primitive Christians, lest you should be cheated, both of your Money and of your Souls?

Now, Sirs, if a prejudicate Opinion doth not interpose, I doubt not but it may be said of you as of those in *Acts* 13. 48. τεταγμένοι εἰς, you are disposed to eternal Life: And then there will be some hope, you will give credit to the Authority of God, in the Gospel of his dear Son, and be willing to learn what may be taught you.

Had not Mr. *James* opposed us in the Point of Holy Baptism, I had not concerned my self with him, believing he was sufficiently confuted about his Calumnies against our Friends at *Ashford* by another hand.

I shall therefore (for the sake of Truth) use my endeavour to elucidate the Point in controversy, that you may have a more clear and distinct knowledg of it.

Neither you nor your Teacher, ought to think it below you to be instructed in any Gospel-Truth, but receive it with meekness and humility; and be thankful to them that will take the pains to do it.

For *Apollos*, who was a great Preacher, and a Man mighty in the Holy Scriptures, did not disdain that a Woman should instruct him in the Way of God more perfectly, *Acts* 18. 24, 25, 26.

And for your better understanding the Point in Controversy, I shall do these three things.

I. Shew you, that Baptism is to be administred by Dipping, Plunging, or overwhelming the Person in Water.

II. That true penitent Believers are the right Subjects of Baptism.

III. That the Ordinance of Baptism is now in being, and is to continue to the End of this World.

I. I shall shew that Baptism must be administred by Dipping, *&c.* if we consider these four things.

1. The Etymology, or Signification of the Word, the Holy Spirit uses to express it by.

2. Those Metaphors used in Holy Scripture, to represent it to our Understanding.

3. From the Practice of the first Baptizers.

4. From the grand Commission of our Saviour, *Mat.* 28. 19.

1. From the Etymology, or Signification of the Word.

The word *Baptism*, is from the Greek βαπτίζω, to dip. *Baptisma*, a Dipping; from βάπτω, *Bapto*, to dip, plunge, or drown. It implieth the washing of the whole Body; even such a washing as is used in Bucks, where Linen is plunged and dipt. For the native and proper signification of it, is to dip into Water, or to plunge under Water; see *Leigh's Critica Sacra.*

It is a Metaphor taken from the use of the Dyers Vat; and is such a Dipping, by which the Cloth put into it is dyed, and not a bare washing only; from whence cometh Baptism.

Zepperus de Sacramentis saith, Βαπτισμὸς, Baptism; *si vocis notationem attendere velimus, vocabulum Baptismi mersionem significat in aquam*, &c. If we will attend to the Notation of the word *Baptism*, it signifies to dip into Water; or the Act it self of Dipping and Washing. From hence therefore, and from the Etymology of the Word it self, it doth appear what was the Custom of administring Baptism

tism from the beginning. Whereas now (saith he) we rather use Rantism (*viz.* Sprinkling) in the stead of Baptism, which is Dipping.

Alstedius in his *Lexicon Theologicum*, printed *Anno* 1612. *pag.* 310. saith thus, Βαπτισμὸς, & βάπτισμα, ἀπὸ τοῦ βάπτειν, *Tingere, lavare, inficere: unde deductum aliud verbum* βαπτίζειν, *intingere, immergere, maximè quidem aquâ. Illud* βαπτίζειν *tantum significat immergere; non lavare, nisi ex consequenti.*

From whence it may plainly be seen, that this Learned Author doth assert, That Baptism is to dip, plunge, or overwhelm the Person baptized in Water: And that its proper signification is to dip, or dye, and not to wash, but only by Consequence. For which he cites for his Authority, both *Plutarch* and *Nazianzen*; as may be seen at large in the Book it self.

Besides this is so well known, that every School-boy in the Greek-Grammar can tell you, that βάπτω, *bapto*, is there rendred *mergo, immergo*, to dip, to plunge or overwhelm.

Also in a *Greek Lexicon*, published and recommended to all, for the encrease of Knowledg, by

Joseph Caryll,	*Matthew Barker,*
George Cokayne,	*William Adderly,*
Ralph Vening,	*Matthew Mead,* and
William Dell,	*Henry Jessey,*

They tell us, that the signification of βάπτω, is to dip, plunge, or drown. And in the Passive Voice, βάπτομαι, is to be plunged, or overwhelmed. And that βάπτιζω, is to plunge, to overwhelm, to baptize, to dip. And in the Passive Voice, βαπτίζομαι, to be plunged, to be baptized, or dipped.

In *Clavis Græcæ Linguæ*, printed at *London*, *Anno* 1640. it is thus rendred; Βάπτω, ψωφα, *mergo, tingo*, to dip, to dye. Βαπτίζω, *Idem*, the same.

Βαπτισμὸς, & βάπτισμα, *mersio*, to drown; and therefore ἐμβάπτω, is often rendred, to dip into, to drown. And from thence the Latins use *mersus, à mergo*, drowned, covered, or overwhelmed with Water. And therefore it is used in the New Testament, for that Holy Ordinance of

Baptism; it being performed by dipping the whole Body of the Person baptized under Water.

The Learned *Robertson*, (my singular good Friend) in his *Thesaurus Græcæ Linguæ*, saith, *Baptizo, mergo.* Βαπτω, *Intingo, mergo*, to dye, to dip, plunge, &c. Hence (saith he) is *Baptizo*, which signifies the same. As also *Baptismos, Baptisma*, &c. But the Greek word Ραντίζω, *Rantizo*, (he saith) is *aspergo*, to sprinkle.

Ραντισμὸς, *Rantismos, Aspersio*, Sprinkling. So that you may easily discern, there is as much difference betwixt these two Greek words, *Baptismos* and *Rantismos* in Greek, as there is betwixt those two words, Dipping and Sprinkling in English; and therefore surely, not to be conceived to be synonimous, so as to signify the same thing.

I now presume, from what hath been said, that if the word Βάπτω, and its Derivatives, are used in all places in the New Testament, where this Ordinance of Baptism is spoken of: Then it will follow, by an unavoidable Consequence, that Dipping is the right manner of Baptizing; and that Sprinkling is not Baptizing.

That it is so, will evidently appear from an Enumeration of Particulars. I will instance in some of the principal, when I come to shew you what was the Practice of the first Baptizers. But of that in its proper place.

I now come to treat of the second Particular under this Head, *viz.* Dipping the Persons baptized into Water, appears to be the right way of administring this Ordinance, if we consider the Metaphors used in Holy Scripture to express it by.

There are two I shall chiefly insist upon: 1. A Burial. 2. A Resurrection.

We are to consider, that our Lord Jesus Christ hath not burdened us under the Gospel, with a multitude of Ceremonies, as it was in that Oeconomy of the Jews under the Legal Dispensation: But only with some few, and those very significant; this being a more spiritual Dispensation.

As therefore the Holy Supper of our Lord in the breaking of the Bread, signifies the breaking of his Body; and the pouring out of the Wine, the shedding of his most precious Blood; and both of these in conjunction his Death, 1 Cor. 11. 26. *For as often as you eat this Bread, and drink this Cup, ye do shew forth the Lord's Death till he come.*

Even

Even so Holy Baptism doth shew forth his Burial and Resurrection; Rom. 6. 4. *Therefore we are buried with him by Baptism into Death; that like as Christ was raised up from the Dead to the Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of Life.*

Now consider the Metaphor: when Men are dead, we bury them by covering the whole Body under Ground, and not by scattering or sprinkling a little Dust or Earth on their Faces only.

Sprinkling (you know) hath no resemblance to a Burial; but dipping or plunging the whole Body under Water, is a most express and lively representation thereof.

But perhaps Humane Testimonies will please you and your Pastor, better than Divine. And therefore I shall give you the Opinion of some Learned Bishops to corroborate what I say, who may be supposed to understand the Original as well as Mr. *James.*

The late Arch-Bishop of *Canterbury*, Dr. *John Tillotson*, saith, in his Sermon upon 2 *Tim.* 2. 19. "Antiently those "who were baptized, put off their Garments, which "signified the putting off the Body of Sin; and were im-"mersed and buried in the Water, to represent the Death "of Sin; and then did rise up again out of the Water, "to signify their entrance upon a new Life; and to these "Customs the Apostle alludes *Rom.* 6. 4.

Also Dr. *Fowler*, the present Bishop of *Glocester*, in his Book of the *Scope of the Christian Religion*, interprets this Saying of the great Apostle, *Rom.* 6. 4. as follows;

"Christians being plunged into the Water in Baptism, "signifieth their undertaking and obliging themselves in a "Spiritual Sense to die, and be buried with Jesus Christ, "(which Death and Burial consist in an utter renouncing "and forsaking of all their Sins) that so answerably to "his Resurrection, they may live a holy and godly Life.

Moreover, Dr. *Jer. Taylor*, late Bishop of *Down*, in his *Ductor Dubitantium, lib.* 3. *cap.* 4. saith thus:

"The Custom of the Antient Church was not Sprink-"ling, but Immersion, in pursuance of the Sense of the "word βαπτίζοντες, both in the Commandment and Ex-"ample of our Blessed Saviour.

"And this (saith he) agrees with the Mystery of the "Sacrament it self; for we are *buried with him in Baptism,*

"saith

" saith the Apostle. The old Man is buried and drowned in
" the Immersion under Water: and when the baptized
" Person is lifted up from the Water, it represents the Re-
" surrection of the new Man to newness of Life.

To this I shall only add that other Divine Testimony of the Apostle *Paul*, Col. 2. 12. *Buried with him in Baptism, wherein also ye are risen with him through the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead.* And shall now proceed to the third Particular, *viz.*

3. It doth appear that Dipping is the right way of Baptizing, from the Practice of the first Baptizers.

The first mention of this Ordinance of Holy Baptism, we have in *Mat.* 3. 1. where *John the Dipper* is mentioned. And in *ver.* 6. it is written, *And were baptized of him in* Jordan, *confessing their Sins.* The Greek word there is ἐβαπτίζοντο; which is in English, They were dipped, plunged, or overwhelmed: For it is from the word βαπτω, to dip, *&c.* as I have already shewed.

In the 7*th* Verse, the word is βαπτίσμα, which signifies the same.

In the 11*th* Verse βαπτίζω, to dip, *&c.*

In Verse the 13*th* βαπτισθῆναι, to be dipped.

The Word is used again in *ver.* 14.

And the same also in the Passive Voice, is used in *ver.* 16. where it is said, *And Jesus, when he was baptized,* &c. And the following words do make that Sense evident; for when he was dipped by *John* in the River of *Jordan*, it is said, *He went up straightway out of the Water:* Which implies, beyond contradiction, That he was in the River, and overwhelmed with the Water, according to the proper and native signification of the word βαπτίζω. And if you will read the 5*th* and 6*th* Verses of this Chapter, you will find there Multitudes thus baptized by *John the Baptist*, (or *Dipper*) for it's said, *Then went out to him* Jerusalem, *and all* Judea, *and all the Region round about* Jordan, *and were baptized of him in* Jordan. The same is also testified in that parallel place, *Mark* 1. 4, 5. and the same Greek words used there as in *Mat.* 3. which I have above recited. And in *Mark* 1. 9. *Jesus was baptized of* John *in* Jordan: The Greek is Εἰς τὸν Ἰορδάνην, *into* Jordan. Now what Sense would this be? Jesus was sprinkled into *Jordan.* But to say, Jesus was dipt into the River of *Jordan*, is good Sense, as well as a great Truth. *Diodate,*

Diodate, upon *Mat.* 3. 6. saith, *They were plunged in the Water.* And the Assembly in their *Annotations*, say, *Dipping in* Jordan. But because they are noted by Mr. *Wells* in his Answer, I shall forbear reciting them, and proceed to other Authors.

Cajetan saith, *Christ was baptized, not by Sprinkling, but by Dipping him into the Water.* And *Piscator*, on *John* 3. 23. *That Baptism was administred by dipping the whole Body in Water.*

Mr. *Mede* on *Titus* 3. 5. saith, "There was no such thing "as Sprinkling used in Baptism in the Apostles Time, nor "many Ages after them.

It is also the Observation of that late Learned and Pious Minister of Christ, Mr. *John Gosnold*, in his Book intituled, Βαπτισμῶν Διδαχὴ; "That Mr. *John Calvin*, up and "down in his Works, doth often (with many others in "our Days) confess, That the Antient manner of Bap-"tism in the Primitive Times was, by dipping the whole "Body under Water. And also confesseth that the "Church hath assumed this Liberty to her self, of using "Sprinkling in the room thereof.

The same Author also observes, "That the Translators "themselves never so much as once in all the New Te-"stament renders it by Sprinkling. There is another "Word for that, which they constantly translate *to Sprin-"kle*, to wit, Ραντίζω, *Rantizo*; whereby it's evident, Rantism is not Baptism, Sprinkling is not Dipping.

Besides, in all the Places that I have met with, where nothing of the stress of this Controversy depends, our Translators have every where rendred βαπτω, &c. to dip. For instance, in *Rev.* 19. 13. *He had his Vesture dipt in Blood.* And in *Mat.* 26. 23. *He that dippeth his Hand with me in the Dish.* Luke 16. 24. *That he may dip the Tip of his Finger in Water.* And in *John* 13. 26. it is twice used, Βάψας, dipped; Καὶ ἐμβάψας, and when he had dipped, *Jesus answered, He it is to whom I shall give a Sop, when I have dipped it. And when he had dipped the Sop, he gave it to* Judas Iscariot, &c.

Moreover, if we will but consider the Places where this Holy Ordinance was administred by the first Baptizers, it will greatly elucidate this Truth.

For

For it was not practiſed in the Temple, nor in their Synagogues, nor yet in private Houſes, in which it might have been done more commodiouſly, if ſprinkling a few Drops of Water upon their Faces would have ſufficed.

But they baptized in the River of *Jordan*, and other Places where there was much Water; becauſe plunging the whole Body under Water did require it.

In *John* 3. 23. *And* John *alſo* (βαπτίζων ἐν Αἰνὼν) *was dipping in* Enon, *near to* Salim, *becauſe there was much Water there*; and they came and were (ἐβαπτίζοντο) dipped. Now here we have the Reaſon given, why *John* baptized in this place, *i. e. Becauſe there was much Water.* But if he had not plunged them into the Water, but only ſprinkled them with a few Drops thereof, this Reaſon had been without Foundation. For as *Cornelius à Lapide* obſerves, A very little Water would have ſerved to have ſprinkled Thouſands. But their manner of baptizing being to dip the whole Body under Water, therefore much Water was neceſſary thereunto, without which the Act of Baptizing could not be performed.

Now altho *T. J.* hath trampled upon our Reaſons offered in juſtification of this Practice, I hope he will not make ſo bold with the Spirit's Teſtimony, as to contradict the Reaſon he hath given in the Text under Conſideration.

Thus you ſee that *John*, who was the firſt Baptizer, and ſent of God to dip Perſons in Water, as the beginning of the Goſpel, and to prepare Chriſt's Way before him; *Joh.* 1. 33. He that ſent me (βαπτίζειν) to dip, plunge, or overwhelm in Water, meaning God the Father. Whereever there is mention made of his Baptizing, the ſame Words are uſed, either *Bapto*, or its derivatives.

If we obſerve what is ſaid of our Saviour's Baptizing, (tho Jeſus himſelf did not baptize (in his own Perſon) but by his Diſciples) in every place the ſame Word is uſed; as *John* 3. 22. καὶ ἐβάπτιζεν. Alſo *John* 4. 1, 2. βαπτίζει, & ἐβάπτιζεν; which all ſignify to dip, to be dipped, *&c.*

To proceed to the Practice of the Apoſtles, and chief Miniſters of the Goſpel, after our Lord's Reſurrection, we ſhall find the ſame Word uſed (as above) in every place, where there is mention made of their Baptizing.

The

The first Instance is in *Acts* 2. 41. *Then they that gladly received his Word, were baptized*, the word is ἐβαπτίσθησαν.

In *Acts* 8. 12. it is also from the same word ἐβαπτίζοντο, *they were dipped, both Men and Women.*

And in *Acts* 8. 38, 39. ἐβάπτισεν, *And he dipped him.*

It is here to be observed, that the Administrator *Philip*, as well as the Eunuch, *went both down into the Water*, (which had been needless, if Sprinkling would have served the turn); Aud when they came there, it's said, *He baptized him*, i. e. dipt him. And then it's further said, *They came up out of the Water*; not from the Side, or Surface of it, as Mr. *James* would insinuate, by distinguishing between from and out of; for here it is said expresly, *they came up out of the Water.*

Also in *Acts* 10. 48. βαπτισθῆναι, to be dipped, &c.

To be short, There is, you see, an Account that *John the Baptist*, Christ (by his Disciples) when upon Earth, and his Apostles after his Resurrection, did all of them practise this Holy Ordinance of Baptism by dipping, or plunging the Persons baptized into the Water.

I will add to this the Testimony of Mr. *Dan. Rogers*; "None of old were wont to be sprinkled; And (saith he) "I confess my self unconvinced by demonstration of Scrip- "ture for Infants sprinkling. And further, in his Treatise of the two Sacraments, *Part* 1. *Chap.* 5. he hath these words, "It ought to be the Church's Part to cleave to the "Institution, which is Dipping. And that he betrays the "Church, whose Officer he is, to a disordered Error, if "he cleave not to the Institution, which is to dip.

And this leads me to the 4*th* Particular, namely, That it will appear that Dipping is the right way of Baptizing, if we consider that grand Commission of our Saviour, *Mat.* 28. 19. the Greek word is βαπτίζοντες, from βάπτω to dip. And being given here by way of Precept, it is Dipping them. But seeing I have already explained the signification of the Greek words by which Baptism is signified, even to tediousness, both to my self and you, I shall insist no longer upon it.

As also, because I am of Opinion that the Gospel of *Matthew* was written in Hebrew, according to *Jerom*'s Testimony, and the Opinion (I think) of most Learned Men. I shall therefore give you the words, so far as they concern

our

our Purpose, under this Head, as they are in that Language, in which I am sure it was spoken, if not written; It is וְטָבְלוּ אוֹתָם *vetabelu Otam*; and dip ye them. The Root is *Tabal*, which is the third Person Singular in the Preterperfect Tense, and signifies, *he dipped*: And is so rendred in many places in Holy Scripture; particularly in 2 *Kings* 5. 15. where speaking of *Naaman* the *Syrian*, it is said, *He dipped himself in* Jordan *seven times, and was clean.*

In *Mat.* 3. 6. you have the same Word again in the Passive Voice, which must be rendred in English, *and were dipped of him in* Jordan. And in *Ver.* 16. you have the same Root again, as it is there applied to our Saviour; *And Jesus, when he was dipped, went up straightway out of the Water.*

Also in *John* 3. 22, 23. the same Word is used. And in *John* 4. 1,2. it is the same in that Hebrew New Testament of Mr. *Robertson*'s, who was certainly one of the most Learned Hebricians our Age hath afforded.

I might add to this the Testimony of the Dutch Translators, who call *John the Baptist*, *Johannes de Dooper*, *John the Dipper*; and in this Commission *de selve dopende*, dipping them. And if our Translators had generally (where that Word had occurred) turned it into English, as they have into Dutch, they had saved me and others the trouble.

Now if all this will not suffice, I know not what will. However I will make Mr. *James* one generous Offer; That if he can shew me where our Translators have in any one place rendred *Baptizo* to sprinkle; or *è contra*, have rendred *Rantizo* to dip, in the New Testament, I will grant him the Cause. And I do hope, if he cannot do it, he will own that we are in the right.

O, what a Tyrant Custom is! that dares stand up and contradict a thing that is so evident in it self, so agreeable to the Reason of the Ordinance, to the Etymology of the Word, (and that from the Pens of our Adversaries) and to the use of the Phrase and Expression in Holy Scripture, to the Commission of our Lord, to the Doctrine and Practice of the first Baptizers, both before and after our Saviour's Resurrection, and the manner of planting the Primitive Churches.

Not-

Notwithstanding all this (I say) Custom in a wrong Way, makes Men bold to oppose the right Way, altho they acknowledg it is the best.

In things civil and indifferent, I can be content that Custom should be my Guide, but not in the Matter of Ordinances, and things Sacred; the Rule of which lies in the Institution, (which we are strictly to observe) and is not in the Power of our Liberty or Choice, either to use or refuse: For that Blessing which attends the Use thereof, is annexed unto our Conformity to the Rule and Institution; see *Mat.* 28. 20.

But to proceed to the second General Head.

II. That true Penitent Believers are the right Subject of Baptism.

I shall make it good by doing these three things.

1*st*. By examining who *John the Baptist* (who was the first Baptizer) did admit to his Baptism.

2*ly*, Who our Saviour commanded to be baptized, in that grand Commission *Mat.* 28.

3*ly*, Who it was practised upon by the Apostles and first Ministers of Christ, pursuant to that Commission. And of these in their Order.

1*st*, Therefore let us examine who they were that *John* did admit to his Baptism.

The first Syllable we read of its being practised, is in *Mat.* 3. by *John the Dipper*, (so called by the Evangelist, *Via Eminentiæ*, as being the Beginner of that Holy Ordinance) where we have an Account, in *Ver.* 2. what Doctrine he preached before he baptized, *Repent ye, for the Kingdom of Heaven is at hand.* And in *ver.* 5. *Then went out to him* Jerusalem, *and all* Judea, *and all the Region round about* Jordan. *Ver.* 6. Καὶ ἐβαπτίζοντο ἐν τῷ Ἰορδάνῃ; *And were plunged (of him) into* Jordan, *confessing their Sins.* The Hebrew word also, is *Vaitabelu, and were dipped*, &c.

Upon this I shall observe some things, and so pass it.

1. That those he baptized were Adult Persons, (and not Infants) for *they went out to him.*

2. That they were penitent Persons, such that confessed their Sins.

3. That

3. That no others were admitted to his Baptism.

For, in *ver.* 7. it's said, *But when he saw many of the Pharisees and Sadducees come to his Baptism, he said unto them, O Generation of Vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the Wrath to come? Bring forth therefore Fruits meet for Repentance.*

4. That no Birth-Privileges will entitle any Person to that Holy Ordinance without Repentance.

For the *Baptist* tells them, in *ver.* 9. *Think not to say within your selves, We have* Abraham *to our Father. And* (in *ver.* 10.) *now also the Ax is laid to the Root of the Tree; therefore every Tree* (*i. e.* every Person) *which bringeth not forth good Fruit, is hewen down and cast into the Fire.*

And to inform them more fully of the Nature of his Commission, and the Qualifications of the Subjects, he further saith, *I indeed baptize you with Water* (unto, or as the Original hath it) *upon Repentance.*

Which agrees most exactly with the Design of *John*'s Ministry, he being to make ready a People prepared for the Lord; Repentance being a necessary Qualification, without which they could not be admitted thereunto.

But some may query, How I prove they were to believe as well as repent?

I answer, in the words of the Apostle *Paul*, Acts 19. 4. John *verily did baptize with the Baptism of Repentance, saying unto the People, That they should believe on him which should come after him, that is, on Christ Jesus.*

From all which it appears, beyond dispute, That no little Infants were the Subjects of *John*'s Baptism. For,

1. They could not come from *Jerusalem* to the River of *Jordan*, and desire to be baptized.

2. Nor could they confess their Sins.

3. Nor yet be able to understand his Preaching, with the Nature and Design of his Baptism.

4. Nor, lastly, could they be expected to bring forth Fruits worthy amendment of Life.

All which agrees only to Adult Persons; they can repent, they can believe in Christ, they can confess their sinful Deeds, and come to tender themselves for Baptism, (as all those did whom *John* baptized) which things little Infants are not capable to perform: Therefore Penitent Believers (and not Infants) were the right and only proper Subject of *John*'s Baptism.

2*ly*, I

2*ly*, I shall consider the grand Commission of our Lord, Mat. 28. 18, 19, 20. *And Jesus came, and spake unto them, saying, All Power is given to me in Heaven and in Earth. Go ye therefore and teach all Nations, baptizing them in the Name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: And lo, I am with you alway, even unto the End of the World. Amen.*

That the Gospel of *Matthew* was written in Hebrew, (as I have touched above) I find it to be the Opinion of divers Men, eminently Learned: And among others, *Hierom*, in the Life of this Evangelist, saith, *Matthæus qui & Levi ex publicano Apostolos, primus in Judæa propter eos qui ex Circumcisione crediderat Evangelium Christi, Hebraicis literis verbisque composuit.* And further notes, *In quo animadvertendum, quod ubicumque Evangelista sive ex persona sua, sive ex persona Domini Salvatoris, veteris Scripturæ testimoniis utitur, non sequatur Septuaginta translatorum autoritatem, sed Hebraicum.* Here you see he tells us, That the Gospel of Christ by *Matthew*, for the sake of those of the Circumcision that believed, was written in Hebrew Words, and Hebrew Letters. And that he every-where, in his Quotations out of the Old Testament, followed the Hebrew, and not the Septuagint Translation.

In Mr. *William Robertson*'s Hebrew New Testament, I find these words between the 18*th* and 19*th* Verses, which I do not find in any Greek Copy.

וְכַאֲשֶׁר שְׁלָחַנִי אָבִי כֵּן
אֲנִכִי שׁוֹלֵחַ אֶתְכֶם

And as my Father hath sent me, even so also I send you. Go ye therefore, &c.

I pray observe in what a solemn manner our Saviour begins this Commission.

1. By declaring his own Authority; *All Power in Heaven and Earth is given to me.*

2. The Fulness of that Authority he gave to his Apostles; *As the Father hath sent me, even so also I send you.*

He then comes to give forth the Commission it self, as in the 19*th* and 20*th* Verses.

The first thing in this Commission is this, Christ commands them to make Disciples by their Ministry. The Word that is translated *Teach*, is in the Hebrew וְלַמְּדוּ *Velamedu*, in Syriac signifies to make Disciples by teaching; for the Root is *Lamad*, he learned. And from thence is formed the Heemantique Noun *Talmid*, a Scholar or Disciple, one that hath learned

The plain meaning therefore is, That they were first to make Disciples by their Ministry, and after that, to baptize them.

If we also examine the Greek Copy, we shall find it to agree with the Hebrew; Πορευθέντες οὖν μαθητεύσατε πάντα τὰ ἔθνη, βαπτίζοντες αὐτοὺς &c. That word upon which the whole Stress of the Argument depends, is *Mathetesate*, which signifies, to make Disciples. The Learned render *Mathetes*, a Scholar, a Disciple; and *Matheteuo*, to be a Scholar, or Disciple. And upon this word in this place, the Greek *Lexicon* renders it, *to make Disciples*.

But if Mr. *James* will not believe our *Lexicographers*, I can give him the Opinion of all the Translators of the New Testament for it, who have rendred it so in a multitude of Places; and so far as I have found, in every place where the word is used, except only in this Commission, and here, (for some Reason best known to themselves) instead of Disciples, they have only rendred it *Teach*. And that which is most remarkable, they have five times in this Chapter rendred it *Disciples*, till they came to the 19*th* Verse, and there only it must be rendred *teach*; as in *ver.* 7, 8, 9, 13, and 16 And in *John* 4. 1, 2. *Jesus made and baptized more Disciples than* John, *but his Disciples*; in both which the same word is used.

And I pray observe the Order of the words, They were first made Disciples, and afterwards baptized; as a prerequisite to fit them for that Holy Ordinance.

Also in *Acts* 11. 26. The Disciples are called *Christians*. And *ver.* 20, 21. it's said, how the same Persons came to be Disciples, The Lord Jesus was first preached to them; upon this, *a great Number believed, and turned to the Lord*. And thus they were made Disciples, according to Christ's Commission.

Besides,

Besides, in *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved.* This place is parallel in Time with *Mat.* 28. 19. And whereas in *Matthew* is required Discipling, there is required in *Mark* Believing, and both before Baptism; It's therefore plain, they must be believing Disciples. And Faith comes by hearing; and therefore the Apostles were,

1. To preach to them; as in *Mark* 16. 15. *Preach the Gospel to every Creature.*

2. By their Preaching to make them Disciples.

3. Being so made, to baptize them.

This is the genuine Sense of our Lord's Commission, *Mat.* 28. 19.

Say some, they own they must first be made Disciples, and afterwards baptized. But then they ask this Question, How do we know that little Infants are not made Disciples, by some secret Teaching of God?

And supposing this to be true, of those who are born of believing Parents, they conclude they may be baptized.

I answer; For Argument's sake, I will for once suppose with them; that not only the Infants of Believers, but all Infants, so soon as they are born into the World, are made Disciples by some secret Teaching of God, (but how we shall prove either of our Suppositions, I know not); Nevertheless I deny that they are therefore to be baptized by virtue of this Commission. And how any mortal Man can know of this secret Work upon their Souls without Revelation, I can't imagine.

But pray consider a few things, and it will set the Truth we contend for in a clear Light. As,

1. It was Christ the Son of God who gave this Commission. *And Jesus came and spake.*

2. Who did he give it unto? Not to his Father to make Disciples of little Infants, by some secret Teaching of his, but to his Apostles that were Men, to make Disciples by their Ministry; *He spake unto them.*

The Conclusion is natural; which I shall form into this short Syllogism.

If little Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men;

Then they cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in this Commission.

But little Infants are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men;

Ergo, They cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in this Commission.

The *Major* is undeniable, the *Minor* I thus prove.

If little Infants have no knowledg to discern between Good and Evil, then they are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

But they have no knowledg to discern between Good and Evil;

Ergo; They are not capable to be made Disciples by the Ministry of Men.

The *Minor* only is questionable, which I prove by Divine Authority, *Deut.* 1. 39. *Moreover your little Ones—— and your Children, which in that Day had no knowledg between Good and Evil.*

So that the first Argument is made good, *viz.* That little Infants cannot possibly be the Subjects of Baptism intended in this Commission.

Whereas some of our Antagonists say, the word *them* relates to all Nations: As they confute themselves, by refusing to baptize Turks and Jews, before they own Christ; so that they cannot extend it universally: Even so it appears, the word *them*, hath no reference unto all Nations, if they will but mind the Grammar of the Text.

For αὐτὰς, *them*, is of the Masculine Gender, (but πανλὰ τὰ ἔθνη, all Nations, is of the Neuter) and agrees with μαθητεύσατε, *Disciples*; and must have reference to them, as the only Persons fitted for Holy Baptism.

But to proceed,

3*ly*, I shall shew you who it was practised upon by the Apostles, and first Ministers of Christ, pursuant to the grand Commission.

We

We find all along in the History of the *Acts of the Apostles*, that Baptism was practised upon grown Persons, that were Disciples of Christ, having gladly received their Preaching, repented of their Sins, and believed the Gospel, which Infants are not capable to perform.

Acts 2. 38. *Repent, and be baptized.* Ver. 41. *Then they that gladly received his Word, were baptized.* Ver. 44. *And all that believed were together.*

Acts 8. 12. *When they believed* Philip, *preaching the things concerning the Kingdom of God, and the Name of Jesus Christ, they were baptized, both Men and Women,* not little Infants. In *ver.* 36. After *Philip* had preached Jesus to the Eunuch, (according to Christ's Commission) they came unto a certain Water; and he asked *Philip, What did hinder him to be baptized?* Philip *answers, If thou believest with all thine heart, thou mayest. And he answered, I believe that Jesus Christ is the Son of God.* And upon that Profession of his Faith, he was immediately baptized. So that we may learn hence, That Faith is a pre-requisite of Baptism; for *Philip* requires Faith of the Eunuch, before he would baptize him.

So in the Jaylor's Case, *Acts* 16. 31. *Paul* requires of him, to *believe on the Lord Jesus Christ.* And in *ver.* 33, 34. it's said, he was baptized, *believing in God,* &c.

Acts 18. 8. Crispus *believed on the Lord; and many of the* Corinthians *hearing, believed, and were baptized.* If these Testimonies are not sufficient, I know not what will.

I could in this place produce divers Testimonies from the Learned (were it needful) to prove that no Infants were baptized for about two hundred Years from Christ. See Dr. *Barlow*'s Testimony: "There is (saith he) no "just Evidence of Infant-Baptism, till about two hundred "Years after Christ.

The Learned *Curcellæus* affirms, "That the Custom of "baptizing Infants, was brought in without the Com-"mandment of Christ, and did not begin before the "third Century.

Grotius, on *Mat.* 19. 13. gives this Account; "That "according to the Rule of Scripture, and agreeing with "Reason it self, the most part of the Greeks in all

" Ages, even unto this Day, retain a Custom of delay-
" ing Infant-Baptism, till they themselves can give a
" Confession of their Faith. And it is certain that *Na-*
" *zianzin*, though the Son of a Christian Bishop, who li-
" ved about the fourth Century, and was bred up in the
" Christian Religion, was not baptized till he was about
" thirty Years of Age.

The same is also true of *Chrysostom*, *Hierom*, *Ambrose*, *Augustine*, and others.

And as the Learned Dr. *Du-Veil* observes, it does manifestly appear, " That the wisest of our Fathers in Christ,
" did not come to Baptism, until they were come to
" a strong and confirmed Age and Wit. So that (it's
" plain) they were not baptized in their Infancy. Yea,
" further he saith, I could never read of so much as one of
" the Antient Fathers, for six hundred Years after Christ,
" that was baptized in his Infancy.

Ludovicus Vives affirms, in his *Treatise de Civitate Dei*, Lib. 1. cap. 27. *Neminem olim consuevisse baptizari nisi adulta ætate, & qui per se peteret baptismum, & intelligeret quid sit baptizari.* None of old Time were wont to be baptized but in a grown Age, and who desired it themselves, and understood what it was to be baptized.

Erasmus in his *Annotations* on the Epistle to the *Romans*, affirms, " That baptizing of Children was not in use in
" *Paul*'s Time.

And Dr. *Field*, in his learned Treatise of the Church, *pag.* 729. affirms, " That many very antiently, who were
" born of Christian Parents, put off their Baptism a long
" Time; insomuch as some were elected Bishops before
" they were baptized. As we read (saith he) of *Am-*
" *brose*, &c.

The Learned *Bossuet*, speaking of the manner of administring Baptism, saith, " We never read in the Scripture,
" that any were baptized otherwise than by Immersion.
" And we are able to prove, from the Acts of Councils
" and antient Rituals, that every-where in the whole
" Church throughout the World, for the space of 1300
" Years, Baptism was never administred but by Dip-
" ping, except only in Cases of Necessity.

And

And *Bellarmine* saith, "Infant Baptism is called an *Apo-* "*stolical Tradition* not written, because it is not found "written in any Apostolical Book. *Tom.* 1. *lib.* 4. *cap.* 2.

Where by the way I shall note, That if a Man of his Parts and Learning could not find it there, I believe others will have as little Success in their search after it: And it had been his Interest to have proved it from Scripture as much as any, because none lay a greater stress upon it than he, and those of his Religion; for they assert it to be necessary to Salvation.

Let Mr. *James* know, we do not bring the Testimonies of Humane Writers, because we think the Holy Scriptures insufficient to justify our Cause. For I may say with *Tertullian*, *Lib. contra Hermogenem*, *Adoro Scripturæ plenitudinem*, *&c.* I adore the Fulness of the Scripture, let *Hermogenes* shew that it is written.

But to satisfy the World that we are not singular in our Judgments about these Matters, as also to obviate an Objection of your Pastor, who tells us in his last Treatise, *Pag.* 20, "That at the rate some *Baptists* write and "report the Words of the Learned, they would perswade silly People, all the Learned Men were almost "*Anabaptists*, an αὐτακατάκριτοι, self-condemned, being "as they are in Opinion, though of a contrary Practice.

I answer, That although they are of a contrary Practice, I hope that can be no Bar to us from reciting their words in favour of our Opinion; for, *Firmum est genus probationis*, *quod ab ipso adversario sumitur*, *ut veritas*, *ab ipsis inimicis veritatis probetur*. It is a forcible kind of Proof, which is taken from the Adversary himself, when the Truth is proved from them that oppose the Truth. And I have herein followed the Counsel of *Lactantius*, lib. 1. c. 6. *Eos suorum Testimoniis revincere*, &c. To convince them by their own Testimonies, which is the strongest Conviction that may be.

As it is truly said by *Chrysostom*, *Tunc illos maxime revincimus*, *cum suorum*, *in eos*, *dicta retorquemus*. We do most forcibly convince them, when we can retort their own Sayings against them.

And therefore as *Lactantius, de vera sapientia, cap.* 12. saith, *Satis firmum Testimonium, ad probandam veritatem, quod ab ipsis perhibetur inimicis.* That is a sound Argument for the proving of the Truth, which is fetched from the Enemies of the Truth.

Yea, suppose it were but weak in it self, yet it hath great weight against him that brings it. For, as the Roman Orator observes in the like Case; *Tuum Testimonium, quod, in alienare, leve est; in tua, quoniam contra te est, gravissimum esse debet.* Thy Testimony, which is but light and frivolous in another Man's Cause, yet is weighty in thine own, when it is against thy self.

Now I fancy that the Reason why Mr. *James* would not have us urge the Testimonies of the Learned, for fear of shewing how contradictory some of their Opinions have been to their Practices, is, lest in so doing he also should be found to be ὧν αὐτοκατάκριτος, condemned of himself; and that in many places of his Book, particularly, when he brings a Poet to prove, that Christ was not baptized by Dipping.

And in *Pag.* 20. he saith, "I would fain know who can "prove our Lord Jesus Christ was dipped, or plunged, "in his Baptism; or any of those baptized Ones spoken "of in the New Testament, were so dipped, or plunged?

I will give you the Opinion of some Learned Men upon it in this very Place, altho I have said sufficient to it elsewhere; and then shew you how Mr. *James* is condemned by his own Pen.

"Now if any one (saith *Maldonate*) ask why the Evan"gelists use the Word of *Ascending?* &c. It was because "Christ ascended, or went up out of the Water, in the "which he had been dipt or drowned.

Lucas Brugensis, saith upon the Place, *Matth.* 3. 16. "Christ descended into the River (after the manner of "others that were baptized) as deep as his Thighs, or "his Navel, for the rest of his Body was dipt by *John*, "and not sprinkled only with Water.

And the Learned *Cajetan* tells us upon the Place, "Christ "ascended out of the Water; therefore Christ was bapti"zed by *John*, not by Sprinkling, nor by pouring Water "upon him, but by Immersion, that is, by dipping or "plunging in the Water.

Many

Many more Teſtimonies might be brought from Men, who uſe Rantiſm inſtead of Baptiſm, but that I have already exceeded my firſt Intention. But I ſhall now ſhew you, that Mr. *James* (like the reſt of thoſe I have quoted) hath contradicted himſelf: For in the ſame 20*th* Page of his Book, where he vapours ſo mightily, and challenges us to prove, that Chriſt, or any others, were baptized by Dipping, as you have ſeen above; yet preſently he tells us, That Baptiſm was oft performed by Dipping, I gainſay not. And in the very next Page he ſaith, I do not produce theſe Teſtimonies, as tho I would maintain that our Lord Jeſus was not dipped. It ſeems his Conſcience began to check him whilſt he was writing.

And again, in *Pag.* 25. Who ſpeaks againſt the Antiquity of *Dipping?* I thought Mr. *James* had. But he goes on, *Dipping* there might be in Chriſt's Time, and that the beſt way of Baptizing. Very well, then it ſeems we practiſe the moſt Antient, and the beſt Way of Baptizing, by Mr. *James*'s Acknowledgment: And himſelf doth practiſe the contrary, and therefore muſt needs be ſelf-condemned, as practiſing the worſt Way; eſpecially if he will conſider, That there is neither Precept nor Precedent for Infant-Sprinkling in all the Word of God.

But to cloſe this Head I am upon: If this be true, that none of the Apoſtles, nor firſt Miniſters of the Goſpel, did ever practiſe the Sprinkling of Infants; there muſt be ſome good Reaſon why they did it not: And the beſt I can think of is, becauſe Chriſt had not commanded them ſo to do. But on the contrary, had commanded them to baptize Penitent Believers, which were Perſons of grown Years; to which Command they were obedient.

And we have great Reaſon to account them faithful: For the Apoſtle *Paul* proteſts, before an Aſſembly of Miniſters, *Acts* 20. 20. He *had kept back nothing that was profitable to them.* And in *ver.* 26. he ſaith, *I have not ſhunned to declare to you all the Counſel of God.* If therefore the Sprinkling of Infants had been profitable for them, or a part of the Counſel of God concerning the Churches, we had certainly heard of it in ſome of *Paul*'s Speeches or Epiſtles: But not one Word being mentioned

about

about it, we may ſafely conclude, it was wholly unknown to thoſe Times, (both as to Subjects and Manner) it being a Practice both unprofitable and vain, as being built upon Humane Authority only, having no Foundation in the Word of God: *In vain do they worſhip me, teaching for Doctrines the Commandments of Men*, Mat. 15. 9.

I will offer an Argument or two, to prove that Infant-Sprinkling is not of Divine Authority.

The Sprinkling of Infants, is either from Heaven, or of Men.

But it is not from Heaven: *Ergo*, It is of Men.

If it be from Heaven, the Holy Scriptures have ſomewhere revealed it ſo to be.

But it is no where ſo revealed in the Holy Scriptures: *Ergo*, It is not from Heaven.

If it be any where ſo revealed in the Holy Scriptures, you, or ſome other, are able to ſhew it.

But you, nor no other are able to ſhew it: *Ergo*, It is not any where ſo revealed in the Holy Scriptures.

If Mr. *James* ſhould tell you he can ſhew it ſo to be, let him give you an Inſtance where it is written, as a Logician ought to do, (the *Minor* being an Univerſal Negative) or let him for ever be ſilent upon this Subject: For it is written. *Rev.* 22. 18. *If any Man ſhall add unto theſe things, God ſhall add unto him the Plagues that are written in this Book.*

I cannot well go off of this Head, without taking notice of a pernicious Notion which ſome of the Learned have eſpouſed.

They will allow us that we are in the right, as to what we aſſert about the practice of the Primitive Churches; but tell us, that their Ceremonies may be lawfully uſed alſo, which they ground upon this following Suppoſition; That it is lawful for Men to bring in things indifferent into the Church, and join them with the Worſhip of God.

And as this refers to the Point of Baptiſm, I will briefly relate what paſt ſome Years ago, betwixt Dr. *Barlow* late Biſhop of *Lincoln*, and my ſelf. It was upon this Occaſion;

Occasion; A Name-sake of mine being taken up upon a *Capias*, and committed to *Ailesbury* Goal, for not having his Child sprinkled, I went to his Lordship (after several Months confinement) to desire his Discharge; and told him, my Friend was not a Member of any separate Congregation, but only doubted of the Truth of Infant-Baptism, which I supposed his Lordship thought he might do, and yet be a good Christian.

He told me, "Yes, for he had tumblings and tossings "about it in his own Mind in his younger Days, but now "he was satisfied.

I desired then to know the Grounds of his Lordship's Satisfaction.

He said, "The Apostle *Paul*, in *Rom.* 13. and the be- "ginning, exhorted the Christians to submit to the "Higher Powers, *&c.* And also the Apostle *Peter* said, "*Submit your selves to every Ordinance of Man, for the* "*Lord's sake*, &c. Now (saith he) you must know "that the Convocation met and concluded, that Infants "should be baptized; and the King and Parliament en- "acted it: And forasmuch as we are required to be obe- "dient to every Ordinance of Man for the Lord's sake, "therefore we ought to do it.

I answered; My Lord, If the Convocation had so concluded, and the King and Parliament so enacted, That Infants should have been baptized in the King's Name, or in the Name of the King and Parliament as Legislators, I believe those People might have complied with it.

He answered, "That would have been odd.

I reply'd, As odd as it is, if they had comply'd with it, the Controversy had been at end.

He said, "That is true; But why cannot they comply "with it now?

My Lord, They have got a Notion in their Heads, that it is not in the Power of any Man, or number of Men in the World, to alter the Nature of Institutions, so as to make that Divine that is in it self Humane, or that Humane that is in it self Divine.

The Bishop reply'd; "They are right in that, for none "can alter the Nature of things but God alone.

Why

Why then, my Lord, forasmuch as you do not baptiz Infants in the Name of the King, or King and Parliament as an Humane Institution, but in the Name of the Father Son, and Holy Spirit, as a Divine Institution, they canno comply with it.

" Well (saith he) there is never a Word of God a " gainst it: It is no where said in the Scriptures ye shal " not baptize Infants.

I reply'd;

My Lord, I shall only put your Lordship in mind of th Notes of a Learned Man upon that of *Lev.* 10. 1, 2. con cerning *Nadab* and *Abihu*, Sons of *Aaron*, Priests of th Lord; who offered strange Fire before the Lord, whic the Lord commanded them not. He saith, It is not suffi cient to say about instituted Worship, It is nowhere for bidden: For it was nowhere said before this time; *Ye shall not offer up strange Fire upon mine Altar.* But because there was a Divine Precept, what Fire they should offer, what Perfume they should mix with their Sacrifices, and the manner of its Composition: And they not observing that Divine Precept; but offering strange Fire, which the Lord commanded them not, they were destroyed by Fire from his Presence. His Lordship only gave me this An swer; He would speak to his Official, to be kind to my Friend that was in Prison, *&c.* but wholly waved the Matter in Controversy; and so I took my leave, and de parted.

I mention not this, as if I thought this Learned Man singular in this Point; for it is too manifest, that many others are of the same Sentiments, without which they could not satisfy their Consciences in the Practice of Infant sprinkling, and other things which they also practise without either Precept or Precedent from the Word of God.

There are many things very ridiculous, that have by Degrees been brought into the Church; of which it is no where said in the Holy Scriptures, they shall not be done. And that about this very Ordinance as well as in other Matters.

As for instance;

1. Where is it forbidden to baptize Bells? This hath been

been practised by the Popish Priests, and that very lately.

2. Where is it forbidden to use the Sign of the Cross in Baptism? as the Popish Priests do thrice, and the Episcopal once.

3. Where is it forbidden to use Cream and Spittle, as the Papists do, to anoint the Childrens Eyes, Nostrils, and Ears, in their Practice of Baptism?

4. Where is it forbidden to put Salt in the Child's Mouth, as they also do? and give this Reason for it, That his Words may be with Grace, seasoned with Salt.

5. And where is it forbidden to baptize your Cattle? And yet how ridiculous would it be so to do? But perhaps Mr. *James* may pretend Scripture for it, from his Interpretation of 1 *Corinth.* 10. 2. For all their Cattle (of which they left not a Hoof behind) *were under the Cloud, and all passed through the Sea; and were all baptized unto* Moses, *in the Cloud and in the Sea.* The Word is ἐβαπτίσαντο, which he leaves to Mr. *Wells* to interpret. And I pray ask him if this Word, as here used in the passive Form, may not be read thus; And they were all overwhelmed unto *Moses*, as they must needs be when the Cloud covered them, and the Waters were a Wall to them on the Right-hand and on the left. So that you see here is the same Ground to conclude, their Cattle were all baptized as well as their little Children: But if the Word had been translated *overwhelmed*, who could have dreamt of a Baptism from this Place?

But Mr. *James* will have it that there was a Multitude of Children baptized by *Moses*, and that it was done by Sprinkling also, through the dropping of the Cloud, and the dashing of the Waters; and that many learned Men doubt not of it; but hath not quoted one of them. I am sure the Dutch Translators, who were Presbyterians, read it thus; *Ende alle in Mosen Gedoopt Zin*; And they were all dipt unto *Moses*: And all learned Men do tell us, when they speak as Scholars, that Βαπτω, is *merge, immergo*; and how it comes to lose its Signification in this one Place, I cannot imagine.

But I pray ask Mr. *James* these few things;

1. Who told him there was Water in that Cloud? For in the Epistle of *Jude* ver. 12. we read of Clouds without Water:

Water: and we must remember that this Cloud was by a Miracle.

2. If it had Water, who told him that it dropped upon the Children of *Israel* whilest they past through the Red-Sea? His *ipse dixit* will not do where the Scripture is silent.

3. How came he to know that the Waters dasht upon them? I cannot suppose that he was present to see it: And if it be nowhere written, 'tis but an improbable Guess.

But to leave off these trifling Fancies of Mr. *James*'s; let us see how it is written, Exod. 14. 21. *The Lord made the Sea dry Land, and the Waters were divided.*

Ver. 22. *And the Children of* Israel *went into the midst of the Sea upon the dry Ground, and the Waters were a Wall unto them on their Right-hand and on their Left.*

Ver. 29. *And they walked upon dry Land in the midst of the Sea.*

Chap. 15. 8. *The Waters were gathered together; The Flood stood upright as an Heap, and the Depths were congealed in the Heart of the Sea.*

Psalm 106. 9. *He rebuked the Red-sea also, and it was dried up; so he led them through the Depths as through the Wilderness.*

Thus you see here is not one Word of Sprinkling, or of dashing the Water upon them. As to the Cloud it was no common Cloud, but a Cloud that did constantly attend them in their passage through the Wilderness; see *Exod.* 13. 21, 22. *And the Lord went before them by Day in a Pillar of a Cloud,* &c. He took not away the Pillar of the Cloud by day, nor the Pillar of Fire by night, from before the People. See also *Numb.* 14. 14. Now if the Waters were a Wall on each side, and the Cloud covered them, then they must need be overwhelmed. *Psalm* 105. 39. He *spread a Cloud for a Covering, and Fire to give Light in the Night.* But not one Word of this Cloud's having Water in it, nor of its dropping upon them. What Cause have you to be cautious, how you admit any thing for Truth upon the Credit of your Teacher; who can allow himself the Liberty to talk at this loose Rate about sacred things? Besides, if this be to be understood of Baptism as an Ordinance,

nance, according to the Use of the Word in the New Testament; then I affirm (according to Mr. *James*'s Logick) if their Infants were baptized, all their Cattle were likewise baptized: But I hope he will be ashamed and blush at such an Exposition; for besides all other Absurdities that attend it, *Moses* is hereby made the first Baptizer, and not *John the Baptist*. But I shall leave this, and pass to the third and last general Head.

III. That the Ordinance of Baptism is now in being, and is to continue to the End of the World.

Matt. 28. 20. *Teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you alway, even to the End of the World.*

Now this Ordinance of Baptism in Water, being one of those things he hath commanded, as in the Words foregoing; then the Apostles were to teach all the succeeding Churches to observe it, they being to teach them to observe all things he had commanded them; and to which also the Promise of Christ's Presence is annexed until *the End of the World*: The Ordinance it self is therefore to continue till that time.

Besides, it was the Care of the Apostles, not only to teach that present Age the Will of Christ, but also to have it continued to succeeding Ages: see 2 *Tim.* 2. 2. *Paul*'s Charge here to *Timothy* is, *The things which thou hast heard of me among many Witnesses, the same commit thou to faithful Men, who shall be able to teach others also.* And our Lord saith to those faithful ones in *Thyatira*, Rev. 2. 24, 25. *I will put upon you none other Burden; But that which ye have already, hold fast till I come.*

But seeing we differ not about its Duration, (although we do about the Subjects, and the right Manner of administring the same) I shall add no more upon this Head. Had I been concerned with another sort of People, I should have thought my self obliged to have insisted more largely upon it.

I beseech you consider what I have said; for it is in true Love to your Precious Souls; that you may no longer

ger be deceived by false Teachers who handle the Word of God deceitfully: But that you may come to understand the true Doctrine of the Gospel, and imbrace that Faith which was once delivered to the Saints; which was at first spoken by the Lord himself, and confirmed by Signs and Wonders, and divers Miracles and Gifts of the Holy Spirit, according to his own Will.

For there is but one Law-giver to the Church, even him who is able to save and to destroy: Hear him in all things whatsoever he hath said unto you. Go in the Footsteps of the primitive and Apostolick Churches; for that is the right Path, and the good old Way; walk therein, and ye shall find rest for your Souls. Consider, it is the Word that Christ hath spoken, that shall judg us at the last Day. The Lord help every one of us who enjoy the Light of the Glorious Gospel, to be found obedient thereunto, that so we may receive that blessed Sentence; *Well done good and faithful Servant, enter thou into the Joy of thy Lord.*

FINIS.

THE
Self-Vindicator
EXAMINED,

And his own *Vindication* weighed in the Ballance, and found too light.

With some Animadversions upon his EPISTLE Dedicatory.

Being an Answer given by Mr. *John Wells* to the second Book written by Mr. *Thomas James*, of *Ashford* in *Kent*, intituled, *A Vindication*, &c.

To which is prefix'd

An Epistle concerning Baptism.

Occasionally written, upon the sight of two Treatises, published by Mr. *Thomas James*, Teacher of a *Presbyterian* Congregation at *Ashford* in *Kent*: Who hath reflected upon the Baptized Christians.

By a Lover of Primitive Christianity.

LONDON,
Printed in the Year MDCXCVI.

TUE

Self-Undurato

EXAMINED,

And his own [illegible]
the Balance, and [illegible]

With some [illegible]
[illegible] Dedicat[illegible]

Being an Answer [illegible]
to the Spread [illegible]
[illegible] Years, [illegible]
[illegible]

To which prepared

An Epistle [illegible]

Occasionally written, [illegible]
Treatise published [illegible]
Teacher of a [illegible]
[illegible] in [illegible]
the [illegible]

[illegible]

LONDON,

Printed in the Year [illegible]

SOME ANIMADVERSIONS Upon the Epiſtle Dedicatory OF Mr. *James*'s *ſecond* Book.

IN the firſt place, I perceive Mr. *James* is deſirous to oblige thoſe Inhabitants of *Aſhford*, and the adjacent Pariſhes, who attend on his Miniſtry, to concern themſelves in the *Controverſy* now depending.

And indeed it is reaſonable they ſhould, if what he did in publiſhing thoſe foul *Scandals* and *Slanders* againſt the *Baptiſts*, were by their Advice: But if not, they may juſtly call him to account for what he hath done: He being but their Miniſter (or Servant) ought to have had their Advice: And unleſs he hath ſo done, they are little concerned in the Matter.

Yet Mr. *James* would inſinuate it, by telling them, That upon ſome Account their Concern is evidently greater. But why the Neighbours, and Parts adjacent, ſhould eſpouſe a *Quarrel*, and become *Enemies* to ſuch as deſire to be at *Peace* with them, and all Men, as much as in them lies, I know not. And had not he began this Quarrel, I preſume you might not have had any Contention about the Matters now depending, betwixt Mr. *James* and the

Baptists. For we are only upon the *defensive* Part; and being exposed (and that unjustly) by him, we are willing to appeal to all good People, and be tried by the Rule of God's Word: And wherein we bring not the Word of the Lord for what we practise in Religious Matters, we are content to be counted Erroneous.

But Mr. *James* represents us so, without trial; and to aggravate the Matter, he saith, *This Neighbourhood hath of long time been the Seat of many Ana-Baptists; and the Stir they have made hath not been small: Witness the Disputation held in the Parish Church*, July 27. 1649. *between* Fisher *and several Ministers.*

1*st*, I presume few will say, that ever many *Anabaptists* were seated there.

2*ly*, But what was the *stir* they have made?

Why, (saith Mr. *James*) witness *Fisher*, with several Ministers.

And pray observe, this was about 46 Years ago: And in all this time he assigns but one more, and that was his Predecessor. Well, what a wonderful *stir* hath here been in *Ashford* with the *Anabaptists?* why, *two* Controversies in 46 Years.

But he adds, And these *Stirs* have not been *small.* It seems as if that Dispute 46 Years ago, did sound in Mr. *James*'s Ears still: altho it's a Question to me, whether he was then born? I suppose not.

But however, Mr. *James* is very uneasy to think of this, and complains of it. Surely this *Noise* looks like silly Stuff.

But he further saith, *They have not come short in my time, having urged me to the same; Though I have only answered, with Contempt of their Challenge.*

How, Mr. *James*, have you answered them, only with contempt of their Challenge? I confess, I am of the Opinion, you out did all the Ministers that disputed with Mr. *Fisher*; for I can assure you, they had a hard tug of it, and came off but lamely.

But Mr. *James*'s Argument would dispatch the Matter presently, with this short word, *I answer you only with Contempt*; and so dismiss the Assembly. And with this he

may

may answer the greatest Disputant that is; together with that other Argument that one urged against Cardinal *Bellarmine*, Bellarmine *thou liest*. Either of these will make short work of any Controversy.

But Mr. *James* saith, *They have not been short in his time, and have urged him to the same.*

Sir, I pray consider what you say: I doubt they have been short in your time: Have they urged you to any publick Dispute? This I am sure, you have urged them by your foul Calumnies, to say something by way of Defence of themselves; at which you are angry without Cause. But if you will prove your Charge by good Evidence, they offer humbly to submit. But if you will not do that, then it is you that urge them, and it is you that have made all this Noise and Stir, and have provoked them to demand Satisfaction, and that publickly; and I am sorry you have given them such Occasion.

But I must needs say you have your Answer ready, for you have answered by Contempt of this Challenge. And indeed I find it so in your *Vindication* (as you call it) against me; for, I confess, I never was answered at such a contemptible rate in my whole life. But such Answers as those surely will not oblige your Friends to engage in your Quarrel: If it do, I must only take leave to admire; for I always believed, since I have received the Faith of the Gospel, That the Ministers thereof ought (above others) to be *meek*, *humble*, *moderate*, *temperate*, and of a sweet and even Disposition, ready to give a Reason of the *Hope* that is in them with meekness and fear, and not to answer with contempt; but meekly instructing those that oppose themselves, and to be gentle towards all Men. But the *Peevish* and the *Froward*, the *Proud* and the *Haughty*, together with the *Envious*, that do arrogantly hold Persons in *contempt*, can never oblige and convert the Gainsayers. But I hope Age, and more Grace, and larger Experience, may in time accomplish Mr. *James* with better Qualifications, than to answer with Contempt.

Indeed Mr. *James* was pleased to tell me, That he did not reflect on the *Baptists*, in his *Spira's Despair revived*.

I told him, None that read his Book could think otherwise. To which he answered, None but prejudiced Persons would think so.

And yet I see in this Epistle to those that attend upon his Ministry, he tells them thus, *The Reflections I made, touching their troubling weak and unstable Souls, and their practices of this kind, are Matters well known to many of you.*

So that now he acknowledges his Reflections on us, for troubling weak and unstable Souls; and says, It is well known to many of you.

Now, if either he, or any of you, can charge any of us with evil doing in this Matter, I pray assign it; and let the Guilty be admonished.

But they are unstable Souls (it seems) they give the trouble to. And such are most subject indeed to ask Questions, and desire to have their Doubts resolved. But if any such should come to our Friends to ask Questions, I hope none of them will be so uncivil to answer them with Contempt, but soberly resolve their Doubts, and satisfy their Scruples, according to the best of their Understanding.

But pray observe how Mr. *James*, according to his excellent temper of Spirit, is pleased to write to his Auditors concerning the Baptists. *Beware of them therefore* (saith he) *and be not terrified and dismayed at their bold and desperate Speeches, cavilling at, and condemning Infant-Baptism as a new Doctrine, a Scriptureless thing.*

Sir, If their bold and desperate Speeches be only to say, Infants Baptism is a New Doctrine, and a Scriptureless thing, we must still be thus bold: But, with submission, that if Mr. *James* can assign any Scripture for it, we shall not be bold in it any longer; for it is the Scripture we abide by for our Rule of Faith and Practice, both in Doctrine and Discipline, in which we find no mention of *Infant-Sprinkling*: But this we find, *He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* And that Infants are safe without it; *for of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.*

But Mr. *James* saith, *God no where in all his Word forbids to dedicate them in Baptism, or refuseth them: Let them shew you that Scripture if they can, which forbids Children to be baptized.*

Sir,

Sir, Is all your *Rhetorick* and *Logick* come to this? Would the common ignorant People ask such a Question as this? Though perhaps they may, because you advise your own People to ask so silly a Question; which I wonder at; Whether God in all his Word forbids it? forbids to dedicate them? If you mean expresly, I say, *No*, nor a thousand other things besides. Is it therefore a Duty that must be done? And to demand of them, to shew the Scripture if they can, which forbids Children to be *baptized*.

I admire how Mr. *James* comes to be so weak. If these be the best Arguments you have to perswade your People, they are very weak that cannot see through all this.

Where are the Services you dissent from, forbidden in the Word of God? If you own this to be a good Argument, you ought not to leave the Church of *England*. I pray, what is there of all their *Services* that is *expresly forbidden?* Nay, by the same Rule you may also go back to the Church of *Rome*.

But if you will allow all to be forbidden, that you have no Command or Example for in the Scripture, then sprinkling of Infants, and all other Humane Inventions are forbidden.

King *David* and his Nobles, were not forbidden *to carry the Ark upon a new Cart:* But God made a Breach upon them for doing it. God was always jealous of his Law, and would admit of no other Administration but of his own appointing. I might assign many Instances of this kind; see the 13*th* Chapter of the 1*st* Book of *Chronicles*, as also 1 *Chron.* 15. 13. where you will find, that God brought that Punishment upon them, because they *sought him not after the due Order*. Changing God's Ordinances, doth bring down Judgments; see *Isa.* 24. 5.

It's no where forbidden in Scripture, that you shall not baptize *Turks*, *Jews*, and *Infidels:* And may it therefore be done? No; Whatever you do as an Ordinance of God, you must have the Word of the Lord for so doing; and not to add or diminish. This agrees with that Advice of the Holy Apostle, *Be ye followers of me, even as I am also of Christ. Now I praise you, Brethren, that you remember me in*

all things, and keep the Ordinances as I delivered them unto you, 1 Cor. 11. 1, 2.

The same Circumspection was observed in *Noah*; *According to all that God commanded him, so did he*; when God had commanded him to build an Ark, *Gen.* 6. 22.

The like was found in *Moses*, who in the making of the Tabernacle, must see that he did all things according to the Pattern shewed him in the Mount. The Particulars of which you may see at large in *Exod.* 25. 9, 40. Chap. 39. in eight or ten places. As the Lord commanded *Moses*, all the Clothes for the Service, and the Holy Garments were made; and whatever was assigned for, and in the Service of God, was not left to the Discretion of any: And when *Moses* did look upon all they had done, and saw they had made all things even, as God had commanded, he *blessed them*, ver. 43.

And indeed, who should dare to do any thing in the Service of God, but as the Lord commands?

See how *Moses* acquits himself in the Case of *Corah*, *Dathan*, and *Abiram*, Numb. 16. 28. *And* Moses *said*, *Hereby ye shall know that the Lord hath sent me to do all these Works; for I have not done them of my own mind*, (doubtless *Moses* durst not do otherwise.)

But Mr. *James* is of another mind, for although he practise *sprinkling*, yet in *Pag.* 25. he doth not disallow of *dipping*; nay, he saith, it may be the *best way* of *baptizing*. But then, to excuse himself therein, he asks this Question; *Was it a total Immersion, or dipping the whole Person in Water?* Yes, Mr. *James*, or else the whole Person was not baptized.

What, (saith he) *without Guesses, Conjectures, and Probabilities?* Yes, beyond all probability, or else every Man may do it according to his own mind; which was more than *Moses* durst to do.

But, (saith Mr. *James*) *yea, but what if so? If Christ give his Churches liberty to baptize by pouring on Water, or other Application?*

Why really, Sir, I could never find (by any Scripture-Authority) that the Churches were ever left to their liberty, to follow *their own Guesses* and *Conjectures*, to use other

other Applications of the Water in Baptism: though I confess you told me, when I was at *Ashford*, there might be an hundred ways of Application. But you must find them out if you can: Yet I should wonder if Mr. *James* should undertake that Enquiry, when he hath acknowledged dipping to be the best way of baptizing; for then why should he seek for any other?

Do you believe that God hath left it to his Church, to use a better and a worser way, or other Applications than the best way of baptizing, submitted to by his Son, and practised by his Holy Apostles? Truly, if you do, I see no reason why you may not comply with any decent Ceremony the Church may invent.

But Mr. *James* would fain insinuate into the Understanding of his Hearers, that we are of the Opinion that God hath less Love for our Children under the Gospel, than he had for the Children of the *Jews* under the Law: And puts the Question thus; "What! hath God less Love for "your Children, than for those of his old People the "*Jews?* Is his Mercy clean gone from our Children? "*&c.*

Alas, we are so far from believing God hath less Love to our Children, as that we say it is a greater Mercy to ours, in that they are not laid under the Yoke of Bondage, which neither they nor their Fathers were able to bear; and so great is the Mercy, that *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven*, (without Circumcision, or Sprinkling) and he blessed a Part as a Pledg of the Whole: For he does not limit that Speech, to exclude any Infant from Heaven; nor is it the Will of God that one of them should perish: See *Mat.* 18. 10, 11. *Take heed that ye despise not one of these little Ones; for I say unto you, that in Heaven their Angels do always behold the Face of my Father which is in Heaven. For the Son of Man is come to seek and save that which was lost*; and Infants as well as grown Persons were lost. And the Grace of Salvation extends to all that were lost in *Adam*; even for dying Infants, who never sinned after the Similitude of *Adam*'s Transgression, *Rom.* 5. 8. *ad infinitum.* And in *John* 1. 29. *Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the Sin of the World.* Now Infants can have no other

Guilt upon them, and Christ of his own Mercy having taken it away, they are in a blessed and happy State, dying so.

But when any come to the Use of Reason, God then requires Duty and Obedience, according to the Light they do or may receive: *For God hath made of one Blood, all Nations of Men, to dwell on the face of the Earth; and that they should serve the Lord*, Acts 17. 26, 27. And in *ver.* 30. *And the Times of this Ignorance God winked at; but now commandeth all Men every where to repent.* And Repentance is in the new and living way of the Gospel, the first Step in Religion. The Father is not to be charged with the Sin of the Child, nor the Child with the Sin of the Father; but the Soul that sins must answer for it self, *Ezek.* 18.

And all actual Sins committed by reasonable Souls, must be repented of, and Faith in our Lord Jesus Christ begotten in them; by the Word being preached unto them, as *Paul* the Apostle *taught publickly, from House to House; testifying both to the Jews, and also to the Greeks, Repentance towards God, and Faith towards our Lord Jesus Christ*, Acts 20. 21, 22. And so *he that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved.* But this is not required of Infants, nor is God's Love and Mercy taken from them, nor Sprinkling any Blessing to them.

And whereas the Question is asked, "Why should you "keep your Children back from the Privilege of so "Blessed a Sacrament, or seek a New Baptism for your "selves?

I answer; There are no Children kept back by us from any Privilege, nor is it any Privilege to any Infant to be sprinkled; nor is it a Blessed Sacrament, but a Humane Tradition and Invention. Nor do we seek a new Baptism for our selves, but we keep to the pure Primitive Way of the Gospel, according to Christ's Institution, and his own Example, *Mat.* 3.

"But (saith Mr. *James*) as for the Point of Dipping, "can you, dare you lay the Stress of a Sacrament, wholly "upon the Quantity of Water, as though the Application "of more, or in any other way than sprinkling or pour-"ing, would profit so exceedingly, or you must needs be "Adult and profess your Faith?

And

And this Mr. *James* doth pray to God, that they who attend upon his Miniſtry, might be eſtabliſhed, and ſtrengthened, and ſettled in, hoping to approve himſelf a faithful Miniſter of Chriſt unto them in all things.

And indeed, ſhould Mr. *James* lay aſide all Humane Tradition, and keep to the due obſervation of the Primitive Inſtitution, and obey the Words and Commandments of our Lord Jeſus, as he doth exhort, direct and perſwade his Hearers, I doubt not, but by the Bleſſing of God, he might be a very good Inſtrument to eſtabliſh and ſtrengthen his People: But if he take the Liberty to make any Alteration of the Primitive Conſtitution, by adding to, or taking from the Word of God, then it may be ſaid, *Who hath required theſe things at your hands?* Rev. 22. 18. Prov. 30. 6. Iſa. 1. 12.

But whereas Mr. *James* ſaith; "They are their "own Enemies many ways, eſpecially their Childrens, "whom they debar of many bleſſed Privileges.

Therein I wiſh Mr. *James* had more fully explained himſelf; for had he made it appear what we debar our Children of that might be a Bleſſing to them, I hope we ſhould readily take Advice to avoid that Unhappineſs: But if his meaning is, becauſe we omit to ſprinkle them, then I thank him that he wiſhes well according to his Underſtanding: But I am ſorry for his Ignorance; for, bleſſed be God, and our Lord and Saviour Jeſus Chriſt, who died to take away the Sin of the World, our Infants are happy, unleſs they commit a ſecond Tranſgreſſion, and then they ought to be truly humbled for the ſame; and upon Repentance and Faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, they may be baptized for the Remiſſion of Sins, and be admitted Members of the Church of Chriſt, and may thereby become Heirs of Eternal Glory.

But as Mr. *James* ſaith; "The ſtrange Diviſions of the "Land of our Nativity, is a ſorrowful Conſideration to all "that fear God, and are by no means to be widened.

This is moſt excellently ſaid, and I wiſh that no profeſſing Chriſtian would give occaſion to widen theſe ſorrowful Diviſions. I pray therefore let all Clamour and Slander ceaſe, with all backbiting and evil ſurmiſing,

that

that kindles a Fire, that breaks out into Flames, and burns, and perhaps scorches the very Consciences of such as kindled it: I pray God extinguish the same by such Ways and Means that be most suitable to a Christian Disposition.

Yet Mr. *James*, I see, is not willing to be understood, that he has done amiss in bespattering us; For, saith he, "I could upon this account, be content most gladly to "be silent; but my Defence, and your Security, will excuse my Undertaking.

Sir, I am sorry you have made so mean a Defence that will not vindicate you, nor secure any (if any be) that shall espouse your Controversy: And had you been silent, it might have been more to your Honour, and greater Peace both to your self and others: And would you but take the Advice you give, you would cool the Heats, and subdue the Passions that boil in your own Breast: For you farther advise well, in these words;

"As for you, my Brethren, believe the Promises, and "observe the Institutions, and obey the Words and Commandments of our Lord Jesus Christ, and keep your "selves pure, that none may be able to speak Evil of "you, or to reproach your good Conversation; this "will give you Peace, and end in Everlasting Happiness.

And the Truth is, such as believe the Promises, according to the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ, observing the Primitive Institutions, and obey the Words and Commandments of Christ, and the Practice of the Apostles, and keep themselves pure in the Doctrine and Discipline, according as it was at first delivered to the Saints; such, I say, need not fear who doth reproach them: they having a good Conversation to adorn the Truth they profess, may have Peace in Conscience here, and Everlasting Happiness in the World to come.

And as to the Point of Dipping, it is Baptizing: But Sprinkling is Rantizing only, which is no where commanded in Scripture as a Sacrament to Infants. And as to laying the stress upon the Quantity of Water, we say, it's not the washing by quantity of Water, but *the answer*

of

f a good Conſcience, 1 Pet. 3. 21. to keep the Ordinance as t was delivered, 1 *Cor.* 11. And as to other Applications, by ſprinkling or pouring, there is not one Word of God for it. With what Conſcience then can that be applied? but that ſuch as are baptized, muſt be adult and profeſs Faith, is moſt evident? for without Faith we cannot pleaſe God, *Heb.* 6. But Repentance and Faith are requiſite in order to Baptiſm: But to that more may be ſaid in a fit place.

And whereas you are pleaſed to recite the *Waldenſes*, "now commonly called *Vaudois*, who were never tainted "with any Corruption of Antichriſt, but certainly the "moſt pure and Apoſtolical in the World, who baptize "Infants, and generally apply the Element of Baptiſm "ſome other way than by dipping, as pouring, ſprinkling, *&c.*

Sir, That the *Waldenſes*, when they were called the *Poor Men of Lions*, (Hiſtory gives a very good Account) and many Years after, were never tainted or corrupted, and were for the Baptiſm of Believers, not Infants; and for dipping, not pouring, or ſprinkling; aſſign it if you can, and in what Century, and it ſhall be anſwered as the Matter may require, if God permit, for I doubt you wrong them: Yet let me not be too raſh, for whether the *Vaudois* that might ſpring from them, be corrupted, I know not; and no great marvel if they be, ſeeing that *Myſtery Babylon* hath corrupted *Nations, Kindreds, and Tongues*: and therefore I would exhort all good Chriſtians to be ſtedfaſt, that they be not turned out of the good old Way, but keep to the Primitive Purity of the Goſpel, without any mixture of Humane Invention, and not to be *toſſed about with every Wind of Doctrine, by the ſleight of Men, and cunning craftineſs, whereby they lie in wait to deceive*, Epheſ. 4. 14.

But wherein Mr. *James* gives good and wholſome Exhortation to his Brethren, and ſuch as attend upon his Miniſtry, I hope they will readily comply with the ſame: And I alſo pray to God that he might really conſider, and walk by the ſame Rule, and do as he adviſeth others.

Take

Take his own words; "And I do earneſtly exhort you "all to attend that Goſpel-Precept, if it be poſſible, as "much as lies in you, live peaceably with all Men, even "with theſe Men, as they are Neighbours; live in Love; "let not theſe Queſtions and Strivings about Matters of "this or any other Nature imbitter your Spirits, and "provoke you to ſpeak unadviſedly, much leſs to be guilty "of any Misbehaviour in your Actions.

This is ſuch good and wholſome Counſel, that I muſt acknowledg it deſerves Praiſe and Commendation in Mr. *James*; and I heartily deſire that all our Friends, though differing in Judgment, would carry it reciprocally kind, where they meet with this ſweet, humble, and merciful Temper: And where they find any otherwiſe, I hope they will not be provoked thereby to any moroſe and evil Carriage, but rather be kind to the Froward, and labour to overcome Evil with Good.

Mr.

Mr. *JAMES*'s VINDICATION EXAMINED.

MR. *James* begins thus; "I received a Letter, "with a printed Book inclosed, being in- "tituled, *A Reply to that part of* Spira's "*Despair revived*: In which the *Baptists* in "general are concerned; but more espe- "cially those in *Alhford* in *Kent*, &c.

In answer to which he makes some Apology, as the reason of it; saying, upon the reading of the same, "I find "it such, as may (if unanswered) turn to my Disgrace "and Contempt. And then further saith, "This shame- "ful Reply (for so it shall quickly be detected) is dedi- "cated to the Honourable Lord *Wharton*, seeking Patro- "nage from so great and worthy a Person, and so abusing "his Name.

Sir, Your Answer is so unhappy to your self, as that it amounts not to a Vindication, having not discharged any of the Miscarriages you were guilty of in your *Spira*: So that the Disgrace you brought your self under by the same, doth still remain; and I presume you may be ashamed of your *Detection* when it is examined.

I pray, what Offence is it in me, to recommend to the Consideration of the Honourable Lord *Wharton*, the Matters and things written, both by you and my self, to make an impartial Judgment thereof, he being the Person under whom your self did seek *Patronage*? But if I should have done

done as you say I did, (although 'tis false) it seems I should have abused his Lordship's Name. But I hope his Lordship was more kind than to think so, in case I had done it.

But, great Mr. *James*, why so swelled? I have had the Honour to speak to, and discourse with as great Men, and in as honourable Courts, and that publickly, as ever Mr. *James* hath done.

And, I pray, why must I be so diminutive in your esteem? But I see you have an excellent Faculty of holding Persons in Contempt; as appears in your Epistle, where you answer only with Contempt.

But, great Sir, if you take the boldness to trouble his Lordship with the Reproach and Scandal you have thrown upon an innocent People, may not I humbly pray his Lordship's Judgment upon it, but that I must abuse his Honour's Name? I dare say his Lordship was of so good a Temper, that if the meanest Person that is should appeal to him for Justice, he would not have taken it ill.

But the reason of my boldness was, from Mr. *James*'s dedicating his Book to his Lordship first; to whom (I hope) I might afterwards appeal without offence.

But if Mr. *James* were so tender of his Lordship's Name, he would have done well not to have used his Lordship's Name to a Book wherein he hath so cruelly abused an innocent People: And I dare say, my Lord delighted in no such Controversies.

But Mr. *James* having so great a Patron, he might think it fancy in any to answer his Book; and indeed he has very sufficiently menaced me for my boldness, after his arrogant manner: And had I not an Antidote against Gall and Bitterness, it might have made some penetration: But softer Words, and more powerful Arguments, might have made a greater Impression.

But Mr. *James* proceeds, saying, " I will confine my " Pen within these narrow Bounds, to write but of the " things concerning the Person that makes the Reply, and " the manner of it.

" The next concerning the Charge which is brought " against what I formerly published in that *Spira*, so far

" as

" as it respects the *Anabaptists*; which consists of two " Parts: One concerning the poor melancholy distracted " Man, *R. M.* and his Tragical End. Which gave me " Occasion to reflect on the *Anabaptists*, as those that did " him some wrong, troubling him with their Notions a- " bout the Necessity of Re-baptization, (or being dipt) " which proved injurious to him in his Weakness, and " strange confusion of Mind.

I reply, *First*, As to the Person that makes the Reply, he craves no Favour, but Justice, and that his Words and Meaning may not be misconstrued and corrupted.

Secondly, As to the manner of it, no Injury is done you, unless you account it injurious in me to enquire after those Offenders that you say are guilty: Which I desire you to assign, that they (if any such there be) might be dealt with by the Rule of God's Word; and that manner of dealing (I presume) cannot be hurtful to any.

The *next* thing concerning the Charge that is brought, so far as it respects the *Anabaptists*, you say, consists of two Parts: One is concerning the poor melancholy distracted Man *R. M.* and his Tragical End; which, you say, gave you occasion to reflect on the *Anabaptists*, as those that did him some wrong.

Now, if this be so, why is it not proved? that others may make judgment of it besides your self. For, notwithstanding it was demanded of you again and again, and you have been at the Press again, with a pretended *Vindication*, we can obtain nothing from you but foul Suggestions, and scandalous Clamours without proof, which is very hard.

But Mr. *James* farther saith; " The other is concerning " what he hath written, of their practising the like upon " many others in such-like Cases; troubling weak and un- " stable Christians, eagerly urging them to be dipt; and, " as I said, making it *a Salve for every Sore.*

Reply; Now this is a full Charge upon the *Baptists*, that they have wronged, not only *R. M.* but many others. And when we desire this to be proved, Mr. *James* seems angry, as if it were an unreasonable Demand: But until it be proved, no judicious Reader can justly allow

allow it to be any thing less, than a Scandal of his own inventing.

And as for his saying, we make Dipping a Salve for every Sore, it is so notoriously false, that any who ever conversed with us, or knew our Practice about Baptism, must certainly know, we never admit of any to that Ordinance, but with great Caution, Admonition, and Instruction, till we are well satisfied with their Humiliation and Repentance, and Faith in the Lord Jesus Christ: That they may be made sensible for what End they obey that holy Ordinance of Baptism, for which we are so much reproached. But it is more unkind to receive such Usage from a dissenting Minister, than from others.

But I find your Discourse is after such a rambling manner, or as you say in another place, a continued Discourse, without any particular distinct Method, that I must be forced to follow you accordingly: And much of it being insignificant, (as your Story of King *James*, and such-like Passages) I may well omit, as not worth the taking notice of it; yet (I hope) I shall answer so fully to every thing that is material, that all judicious Persons may be satisfied, and then I shall very little regard those Clamours that you may let fly against it.

I perceive your Design is to raise a Dust, and beget a prejudicate Opinion in your Reader (if possible) against me; saying thus, "In doing this, I will consider the most "material Passages in that Piece, laying open the Ignorance and Injustice of the Publisher. And you are pleased to say, That what I have published, are meer Slanders and Falshood; and that my *Reply* is meer Slander, and bold and impudent Denial and Contradiction.

And having thus ridiculed me, he pretends to evince the Reader of the Matter of Fact; and he begins thus: "The "first thing which I consider, and is very material, is the "Person that makes the *Reply*. And then he recites my words in that *Reply*, in *Pag.* 2, 3. *viz.* "Sir, I am a Stran-"ger to you, and to the whole matter, any otherwise "than as I met it in your Book, (and some Friends near "you gave me some Account) which has loaded us with "a greater Weight than is fit to be born.

And

And then he cries out, "Now surely this is a strange "thing, and most unrighteous, unjust, and it may be un- "parallel'd: For a Person that owns himself a perfect "Stranger to me, (and indeed he was, and is) upon the "reporting a Matter to him, to write and print at this "rate against me: What, a Stranger to the whole Matter, "and yet to print at this confident rate.

Now, Sir, I pray consider what a Noise you have made of my being a Stranger to you, and to the whole Matter: Why do you forget these words, *Any otherwise than I meet with it in your Book?* And might not a Stranger be informed by your Book? And it was that which informed me, and other Strangers, that were troubled and ashamed of it; and more especially as coming from a Dissenting Minister. And it seemed most reasonable to me, and many others, that such as you accused, should be found out; and if guilty, be exposed for their Folly.

But you are civil to give me the Title of Mr. *Wells*; I shall not carp at it as you did, when I gave you the Title of *Worthy Sir*: For you were at a loss (it seems) whether you might or no, not knowing my Quality or Calling: But however you did presume (at last) to give me the Title of Mr. *Wells*.

This was civilly done, and you did not err in it: For besides the several Commissions I have had, both Civil and Military, which bespeaks me no less, I have always accordingly paid as such.

But you say you give me this Title as *a Preacher*. Now as such I am but a Minister, which in English is but *a Servant*. But some in this Age are grown so arrogant, that Servants affect to be called Masters. But as I am a Minister of the Gospel, I desire to be (as I ought) a Servant to all.

And indeed it is the Advice of our Great *Lord and Master*, *Not to be many Masters*, or *to be called of Men* Rabbi. But such as love to be great, and look lofty, and delight to be called of Men *Rabbi*, *Rabbi*, (viz. *Master*, *Master*) such are not fit for Ministers (*viz.* Servants) in the Gospel: And it is unhappy we do not speak English to our Servants; for the poor ignorant People think a Minister is their Master; when (God knows) the Word signifies a Servant, and we ought to be Servants to all; see *Mat.* 23.

6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12. *Luke* 22. 24, 25, 26, 27.

In the third Page Mr. *James* carps at me for calling him *Worthy Sir*.

Pray, Sir, be not displeased with me for my Civility towards you; many mistaken Men (as Mr. *James* is) may deserve that Title. And to have called you *bold and impudent*, (as you serve me) might have sounded as harsh in your Ears, as you say *Greek and Hebrew* doth in mine: And I was not willing to offend you; therefore if I should use that Civility again, pray take it not ill.

But I find also that Mr. *James* takes another thing ill, namely, that I did not send a few Lines to him before I printed, to enquire what Defence he could make for himself. But alas, it was too late! for Mr. *James* had published us in print to the World, and exposed us to Shame and Reproach: Therefore nothing less than a publick Reply could repair our Reputation. And if Mr. *James* had considered the Design of my Book, which was, to enquire into the Truth of his Calumny, and to find out the Offenders, (if any were) that they might be exposed and put to shame, he had no reason to take it ill. But I cannot find any of our Brethren, of the Baptized Christians, guilty of what Mr. *James* charges upon them; notwithstanding I was at *Ashford*, and heard what was said by Mr. *James* and them, Face to Face. Nor doth Mr. *James*, in his (pretended) *Vindication*, set forth who they are, nor hath he yet done it; and until he doth, there is reason to conclude he cannot: And that it was only a transport of Zeal (or worse) which prompts him to say, *The Baptists might do* R. M. *some wrong*, &c.

But to deal plainly, it had been kind for Mr. *James* to have asked the *Baptists*, before he had printed, Whether the Matter of Fact he charges them with had been true?

Yet I have that Charity for Mr. *James* still, that if it were now to be done, he would not do it: But seeing it is too late, let Mr. *James* but as publickly acknowledg his Mistake, or Error, as he has exposed us, and by my consent it shall be full Satisfaction: but if he do not, it must be left to the Judgment of the judicious Reader.

But Mr. *James* would have me to confess my Fault as publickly; which indeed I will, if he honestly assign it,

and think it no dishonour to submit, if he convince me of Error; but I do not see it yet.

For Mr. *James* extreamly misses the Matter; for the great Stress he lays it upon is, That I did all by the Instigation of my Friends, and did things hand over head by their Information.

Dear Sir, be not so unkind as to think I acted so foolishly; I assure you I did it conscionably, and your Book is the Subject of my Discourse. And of what I was informed I tell you, as in the 15*th* Page of my Book, *Viz. For it seems to me by the Account I have*, &c. So that where I have any thing by Information, you (or any one that reads my Book) may easily perceive it; and do but assign wherein the Information is false, and it shall be detected, and such part shall be acknowledged wherein you prove it false; but you have not done it yet.

But what you say yet is after a *Billingsgate* manner; as, *unjust*, *bold*, *impudent*; and in another place, *lie*. Now this is no Proof, but idle Clamour; nor is it like a Gentleman, or a sober Christian. But to wave this Discourse, what you really prove to be false, shall be allowed; and I shall pass over much of your Clamour as not worth the answering.

But in the 4*th* Page you are at it over again, *viz.* "Had "but the Letter sent me with his Book, been sent some "Months before, his Pains and Trouble might have been "spared, and his Credit saved; whereas he hath brought "himself into a Snare, to gratify his Friends who impo"sed upon his Credulity.

Sir, You exceedingly mistake the Point still, for a Letter could not do, your Book being out in Print: Nor did my Friends impose upon my Credulity; but your Book exposed us, and ought to have been answered if they had never sent to me.

And in the 5*th* Page Mr. *James* is at it again, which makes me admire that so great a Scholar should be subject to so many Tautologies, *viz.* "And make good his Charge on"ly, being informed by those whose Interest it was, to "blast what I had written.

Sir, I say again, it was your Book informed me, and they had no need to blast what you had written, for you have done it your self.

But in the *6th* Page you carp at my Title, for calling it *A Brief Reply*. Sir, I can justify the Title, and want not your Advice; for your unjust Charge is removed until you prove it; and when you do that, I will beg your Pardon.

And then you carp at my handling the Text, *Prov.*8.17. and scoffingly cry out, "A mighty Search, because my "Neighbours gave him some Account.

But your Book from which I take the Account, you take no notice of; when that is it I take my Information from: "I do not see with my Friends Eyes; this is all Clamour and Folly.

And in the *7th* Page he is still upon the same Topick, of believing my *Ashford* Friends; and saith not a word of his Book, as if he had never writ one. But I hope such as read our Books will see, that I ground my Discourse upon his Book, and not upon my *Ashford* Friends Information; but wherein I do, I distinguish between the Book and the Information I had from any, which is very little.

But I am arraigned for my Ignorance in the *8th* Page, *viz.* "But Mr. *Wells* is no Logician, or the meanest ever "known. That is in English, a Man of little or no Reason, (for Logick is Reason); but Mr. *Wells* hath none, or the least ever known.

Well, Mr. *James*, I must be content to be a Fool, that you may be wise; but it will be well if you do not prove otherwise when we come to try the Matter, (if it may be) for I have had to do with as great Logicians as Mr. *James*, that have used their Art and Learning to darken Counsel, and being weighed in the Ballance, have been found too light. But Mr. *James* hath an excellent way of evading the proving of the Matter; for in the *9th* Page he said, *viz.* "It "is time to leave Mr. *Wells* himself, and come we now to "the Matter of Fact, *&c.* And when you would expect he should come to it, he lets you know that "Mr. *Wells* "urgeth wonderfully to assign the Person or Persons "guilty of what I charge the Baptists with, (and indeed "I do so); and saith Mr. *Wells*, if I fail herein, he com- "mends to my Lord *Wharton* to see that publick Satisfacti- "on be given, and to my Church to take a Course with "me.

Sir, This I do, first, because you dedicated your Book to my Lord *Wharton*, to whom I did appeal. And, secondly

condly, your Church do acquit themselves well, if they examine the Matter of Fact, and see how you can clear your self; all which I think is very reasonable. But Mr. *James* evades it, if it will do, and saith, *viz.* "But now "what if the Case do not require all this? Why truly if the abusing and slandering an Innocent People in so gross a manner, do not require an Examination, Mr. *James* may go on without controul. Nay, he seems to shew a Reason (such as it is) why: For, (saith he) "What if it be not convenient or necessary? What must "a Minister tell the *Anabaptists*, and all the World, what "every one in Trouble discourses to him? So that it seems Mr. *James* writes and prints by Information of People in Trouble, and may publish it to the World, concealing their Names. But he will have it criminal in me, to take Information of any, altho well in their Senses, and not in such an extasy of Trouble. But, saith Mr. *James*, 'It may be Husband or Wife, Parents and Children, Masters and Servants, are concerned: And the like Circumstances are such, that it is no ways fit or meet to name, or assign the Persons.

Now if all this will do, Mr. *James* may say what he pleases, and bespatter whom he thinks fit; and take the boldness to abuse whom he will at any rate, and tell the World, and the People he bespatters, that he is a Minister, and must conceal the Persons that told him, they being in trouble of Mind; and he will justify what he hath said is true, but it is not fit or meet you should know who they are. Now what Stuff this is, let the Reader judg. But the *Anabaptists* are the Criminals, and who they are of them we must not know: if we should, what Mischief may we pull upon others Heads? (saith Mr. *James*) and to prevent it, Mr. *James* will not name the Persons.

Sir, I pray be kind, and do as you would be done unto: If any have been so evil as to give a false Information, let us know who they are. But if your Information be true, justify the Charge against the Guilty, and we shall take it kindly, and deal with such by the Rule of God's Word, as the Merits of the Cause will require.

"But this (saith Mr. *James*) is an extravagant Request, to urge the printing of Names of private Persons.

But I think it was more extravagantly done of Mr *James*, to take Information from any that would not, c durſt not ſtand by it, and yet publiſh to the World th *Baptiſts* to be a very perilous and dangerous People, as b the Information he has had from ſome that were in trou ble ; but who they are muſt not be known: which beget a Jealouſy in ſome, that Mr. *James* has done all this o his own Head ; but when any other do appear, more ma be ſaid, but I would have the Guilty only ſuffer : An truly if no better Evidence does appear, many will be lieve Mr. *James* is the Man. But I refer to better Judg ments.

But in the 10*th* Page Mr. *James* doth ſuggeſt, we ma lie upon the Catch, to prevent which he will name none " For, ſaith he, ſuch an One is none of them, though " may be a Teacher, or an old *Anabaptiſt*, or nothing, *&c.*

But, Sir, pray why ſo many Evaſions ; theſe are mo evil Suggeſtions: be ſo kind as to try the Matter, and the ſpeak as you find.

But you ſay you do but ſhew how vain it is for Mr *Wells* to urge the aſſigning of Perſons; and I am afraid it is in vain indeed, for I doubt you cannot; and yet yo ſay, " Proofs I have ſufficient to produce, and abundant " and yet will ſpare Names, even of the moſt Criminal.

Sir, I am afraid all this is but a Bounce ; for if you hav ſuch Evidence, and abundant Proof, why ſo ſparing of i when the whole Charge lies upon your ſelf? And it wi ſo remain, until you clear your ſelf by ſome other Ev dence.

But now to the Caſe of the poor melancholy Man *A M.* that you viſited; and ſay, *viz.* " That one of th " ſame Name, of his Kindred, deſired me to go an " viſit him, upon the Account of his deplorable Cond " tion; and he importuned me not a little, uſing this " a ſpecial Argument, that he was continually aſſaulte " by the *Anabaptiſts* about Rebaptization; which was " great Trouble and Vexation to him.

Sir, That you were deſired to give him a Viſit, may b true, and your ſo doing is not blame-worthy ; but th ſpecial Argument uſed by his Kinſman to you, might b but his own Imagination ; for I ſpoke with *R. M*'s Siſte and ſhe believes no ſuch thing, that ever he was aſſaulte

b

by any of the *Baptists*, or that any were a Vexation to him. But if his Kinsman say it, he ought to prove it, or allow it to be but an Imagination of his own.

But Mr. *James* saith, He was well satisfied that the Opinion of the *Anabaptists*, about Rebaptization, was a great Trouble and Vexation to him. And truly perhaps it might, for he had no good Opinion of Infants Baptism; and the other he did not comply with, which might trouble him: it did not for ought I know; but his Sister with whom he lived, doth not believe it was any of his Trouble.

But Mr. *James* saith, in *Pag.* 11. *viz.* "Surely what I "learned from himself, was a thousand Witnesses to me, "and what was clear enough by other Circumstances.

Now here was a clear Evidence, nay as much as a thousand Witnesses; yet what he said he has forgot, for he tells us, in *Pag.* 10. Truly his Memory is not so happy: But yet he ventures to tell you that his Suggestions are true; and them that will believe it may. But for my part, whatever might be said by a Man in that Condition, I think would be but very sorry Evidence.

"But see (saith Mr. *James*) how it pleased God to put "them to shame, and to condemn them out of their own "Mouths: One of their Teachers did own to us, that he "was with him the same day, or the next after I was "there, and that he discoursed of these Matters, and that "he urged Believers Baptism to him. And in the *Margin* sets *H. L.* but Words at length had been better; but I suppose he means *Hen. Longley*, who is neither afraid nor ashamed to speak for himself, and to give a true Account of what he said, or knows of the Matter: And when I was with him and *Mr. James* (as I was) at *Ashford*, and I desired *Mr. James* to charge him; and told them both, I would spare *Hen. Longley* no more than I would *Mr. James*, as they were Face to Face, and expected then a full Charge against him. But *Mr. James* said, before several Witnesses, he had nothing against him, nay, nor against any of the *three Teachers* as he calls them, they all being present. Now this being so, what a mighty Noise is here to little purpose?

Yet Mr. *James* ventures to tell you of another Baptist-Teacher, that discours'd *R. M.* about an Hour: take his own words, *viz.*

" Yea further, at another Time, as the Woman confeſt " unto me, in the preſence of a Gentleman who accom- " panied me to her Houſe *June* 12. there was one *F*—— " another Teacher among them, who viſited him, and had " private Diſcourſe with him about an Hour.

Now by this *F.* it ſeems he means one *Chriſtopher Fullford*, by which you may ſee Mr. *James* does not ſcruple to name Names, or at leaſt a Letter for their Name, by which they may be known, when he thinks it will make for his turn, eſpecially if it happen to be a Baptiſt; but if you ask him for the Names of any that (he pretends) accuſe the Baptiſts, then he tells you it is not meet nor reaſonable to name Perſons, it may be of ill Conſequence to them: So that Mr. *James* is very tender of any but the Baptiſts, and is not willing any other ſhould be expoſed and brought to Examination; and whether there be any ſuch we cannot tell, but if there be, and that they do appear, I hope we ſhall readily give them all the Satisfaction we reaſonably may or can; for we do take care to find the Offenders, (if any be amongſt us) and therefore this *Chriſtopher Fullford* was ſent to, to know if he were Guilty; and pray take his Anſwer as followeth.

Sandwich, Sept. *the* 7th, 1695.

Having receiv'd an Account from Mr. *Chriſtopher Cooper* of *Aſhford* in the County of *Kent*, that I ſhould inſinuate or perſwade one *Robert Millen* of *Weſtwell*, in a ſtate of Deſpair or Diſtraction, to be dipped, in order to true Peace; this in ſhort is to teſtify in the Preſence of Almighty God, before whom I muſt be judged at the laſt Day; that I never had it in my Thoughts, nor ever expreſſed by my Tongue to offer any ſuch ridiculous thing to him: I bleſs God I have been better inſtructed into the way of admitting Perſons into the order of the Goſpel. This is to let you know, that if this will not ſtop the clamorous Tongue of an Enemy to Truth, ſend me but a few Lines, and I will meet him Face to Face, and queſtion not but God will appear ſo much for his Truth, as he will be aſhamed. In witneſs hereunto I have ſet my Hand, the Year and Day above written,

Chriſtopher Fullford.

Now if Mr. *James* is not satisfied with this Answer, you see he offers to give Mr. *James* a Meeting Face to Face.

And why should not Mr. *James* be as fair to us, as to name the Persons that do accuse the *Baptists*; and let them also come Face to Face, that the Criminals (if any be) may appear and be ashamed? and whether this be not reasonable, must be left to the impartial Reader.

But Mr. *James* further saith, *viz.* "How shameful was it "for Mr. *Wells* to publish thus, *page* 11. First we do ob- "serve, that you were the only Man that visited, discoursed, "and advised this poor Man in his deplorable Estate?

And I confess I do say, in page 11 of Mr. *James*'s Book, it appears he was the Man only, or chiefly concerned with him in his hurry and trouble of Mind; for in his Book I find no other: but to the end he may not be thought remiss, and the better to seem clear, he tells you of some to be mentioned that he saith did so much wrong; and then cries out, O shameful!

Well, Sir, I pray let me give my true Sense, and you may bear with me the more, because you judg I am ignorant, and I am so still of any besides your self that did visit and advise him in that hurry of Mind, for any thing that I found in your Book which I enquired of, and replied to, and still say you are the only Man (as aforesaid) that I find there; for I could find no other assigned, only you say some other might be named that has done much Wrong; and these are the Men I enquire after and cannot find them yet, but did expect them in your Vindication: but you fail me there also, and the Reason you give is, you will not name Persons, but if you will not, we must leave it to the Reader to judg of the Matter, whether it be reasonable to charge the *Baptists* with such foul Crimes as you have done, and not to assign the Parties; the three Preachers as you call them you had nothing against.

But in the 12*th* Page he reflects upon Mr. *Wells*, and saith, "Yet Mr. *Wells* saith, we observe that you were the only "Man that visited, discoursed, and advised the poor "Man in his deplorable Estate; what will the World "think of this? what can they? To begin his Reply thus, "first we observe; truly if you observe at this rate, you "may observe 1, 2, 3*dly*, and infinitely (and thus scof- "fingly speaks) even as far as you please or can invent.

To

To which I answer, I do still say I could observe no other in your Book, which is the Ground on which I wrote, no other being named in it; but if there had, I should have observed as much of them had there been the same reason for it, and farther I durst not, for I dare not invent things which I know not, nor speak but as I find; and finding you by your own Acknowledgment, I speak to you only: But desire you to assign others, (if any be) nor do you now in your Vindication assign any that did him Wrong, so the Slander yet remains.

But you say, "How was I conversant with him, for it "implies a Familiarity, frequenting a Person's Company?

I confess it doth, and herein I acknowledg I might be mistaken, taking for granted what I ought not; yet if he were a Hearer of you about 2 Years, and you telling in your Book the Pains you took with him, and the Advice you gave him, inclined me to think you had been conversant with him; but if not, I beg your Pardon, and wish you would as readily recede from what you have most presumptuously asserted; and it would be more for your Honour, than to plead Justification to that you cannot prove.

I shall pass over that of the 12*th* and 13*th* Pages, only that which respects *R. M*'s being advised by Mr. *James* to go to board: and pray what do I say but what I was informed, and fairly tell you so? (but all the rest of the Matter your Book informed me) and his Sister makes good what I was informed, if she may be believed, for she saith her Brother told her he was going to Town to Board, and to make use of a Physician as you directed, and went accordingly; and do not I say as it seems, and as he told his Sister who justifies the same still? And she farther saith that at his return Home, which she wondered at, (being he went to Board for some Time) and asked the Reason of it; and he replied when he was there, he overheard them, one saying he was in Love, and another that Mr. *James* should say he had not a Dram of true Grace, at which he got away, and related this to his Sister: And why must this by you be called my Invention, when I wrote but as it seemed, and as I was informed? yet you would have the World believe I invented it.

And then you are pleased to ridicule me for my natural Logick, with many slighting Terms; but I perceive it is as

you

you say in your Epistle, you answer with Contempt; but more Modesty might have become you better.

The 14*th* Page I pass over, being most of it impertinent Matter, only I take notice of your hard Usage of me, " That my matter is a wild Romance, and a Tale told, and " a foul pack of Lies; but assign not any, only by such Suggestions and Presumptions, as that he can boldly tell you they are a foul pack of Lies: but 'tis easy to see the Gentleman is in a Passion; for he tells us in the 15*th* Page, " He " will break through all, as *Sampson* broke his Withs and " Cords, shewing that he is a Man of Might. But I doubt not (by the Blessing of God) but to cut his Locks, and then he will be like other Men, when the Valour of his Heart is abated; and then I hope to find him in a better Temper than to give the Lie, or any foul Language.

But in the 16*th* Page, Mr. *James* undertakes to propound the Case plainly, (*viz*) " I propound the Case plainly, " and answer it home, these are the things he quarrels " with me for, for having reflected on the *Anabaptists* as " industrious to make Proselytes, and urge Dipping, as " tho all Religion did consist in going down into the Wa- " ter; and in short, he challenges me to assign the Guilty, " or else he saith, *Page* 21. it must be concluded you can- " not, and then in what a shameful Case will you appear.

Yes, Mr. *James*, I do say so still.

But to answer this Home, you say, " Now as to my as- " signing the Criminals I have already said a little in an- " swer thereunto; (*and a very little indeed*) it is not al- " ways fit and meet, nor is it material; *Cui bono*, to what " good would it be?

Sir, is this a home Answer? this is still to evade the Matter, for you assign not any, it's still concluded, 'tis because you cannot: but you say it is not fit nor meet, and yet take the Confidence to say, " I have named some to their " Teachers, and instead of taking a Course with them, " they thought to take a Course with me.

Sir, if what you say be true, let these Criminals be exposed both Teachers and others, or else you expose your self, and will unavoidably fall under the Censure (and that truly) of Backbiting and Slandering your peaceable Neighbours.

Yet

Yet you bouncingly tell us; "But to clear all at once, and then tell us of several Depositions you have by you, "and behold one in Form, *viz.* I *N. N.* do own and testify "that *N. N.* hath discoursing, and to my great Vexation "and Disquiet, urged me to be dipp'd, setting forth the "absolute necessity thereof to Salvation; inveighing a- "gainst those that practise Infants Baptism, as Antichri- "stian, and urged me to be dipp'd, as ever I expect to en- "ter the Kingdom of God: Witness my Hand *N. N.* "And let Mr. *Wells* know (saith Mr. *James*) that I have "several Depositions of Persons by me.

Sir, I pray let us have them all, that we may see whether they be like this; but if this be true, it gives you no relief, for that which you are to prove, is this.

1. That the *Baptists* finding this poor Man *R. M.* in Trouble, thought to make a Proselyte of him.

2. That they acted so inconsiderately, and did him so much Wrong: now you must prove what Wrong this was, and how much.

3. That they sat in, and told him in his Trouble, his way to have Peace and Comfort, was to be dipped.

4. If a Man or a Woman come under trouble of Mind, and they spy it out; or if any one be newly joined to their Fellow-Dissenters, of other Opinions, immediately they set upon them, thinking now is their time to proselyte them to a Party.

5. You must prove that they urge Dipping, and lay such a Stress upon it, that they make it a Salve for every Spiritual Sore.

6. That they make all Religion in going down into the Water.

7. That they take advantage of the bodily Weaknesses, Infirmities and Confusion of Minds, to win Persons, or rather draw them to a Party.

8. You must assign more than a single Person, that has been guilty of the Crimes aforesaid.

You must prove that you had just occasion to reflect on the *Baptists*, as those that did *R. M.* some wrong, as to his tragical End.

2*ly*, You must prove what you have written of their practising the like upon many others in such-like Cases.

Which

Which if you do, I hope to make good what I promised you in my Book, that they shall be dealt with by the Rule of God's Word. But if you do not make good your Charge, I must say you have greatly exposed your self, and will appear to be a busy-body, and a troublesome Man to your Friends and Neighbours, (and Fellow-Dissenters, as you call them) by aspersing, clamouring, and abusing them, by evil Suggestions and Surmises; and then publish them to the World to be such as you have imagined them to be, and censoriously judged them to be notorious wicked Men, and have maliciously bespattered them as Men and Christians, rendering them unfit for Common Conversation, or Christian Society, but a most pernicious People, and not fit to be convers'd with. And when we desire a Reason why you deal thus with us, we can obtain none: But to evade the Matter, you say, you will not publish Names, or Persons. Indeed this is a very poor Shift, and a sorry Vindication, that will stand you in very little stead. You know my Reply to your Book was to enquire after the Offenders you accused; and you seem to vindicate your self to me, (and all Men that read your Book) by saying, It is not meet to name the Persons that should prove the Charge and Scandals that are put upon us.

Pray, why are you so tender of the Persons that should justify what you have printed and published to the World, so as to conceal them, when your own Reputation lies at stake for want of proof? Indeed you are very kind to them (if any such be) that dare not appear in this Matter, but mighty rude and unkind to those you have bespattered, for they must stand accused, and not be heard nor tried, but yet judged (by whom?) by Mr. *James*. And yet I am of Opinion, that most that read our Books, must think that Mr. *James* cannot prove these foul Scandals he has unadvisedly thrown upon us; and I am apt to think he has taken too much upon himself. Yet Mr. *James*, after the Deposition aforesaid, seems as if he would abate much of what he could say; and cries,

" But alas, should I go about to lay open the Practices " of the *Anabaptists* about us, and reveal what many told me, with great bitter-

" nefs of Spirit, how burdenſome their very Lives are " to them, by reaſon of their importunate Solicitations " to bring them to be dipt; and their deſperate Speeches, " ſtriking Terror in their Minds, vexing their Souls con- " tinually, it would, no doubt, ſound ſtrange to many " Readers.

But, Sir, are you ſo favourable as not to lay the *Baptiſts* ſo open as you might do? Why then truly they are exceeding bad; for, you ſay, they are very terrible to their Neighbours, and ſo burdenſome, that they are vexing their Souls continually; and ſo importunate and ſolicitous to bring them to be dipt, that as Mr. *James* ſets forth the Matter, it is dangerous to live near them. Nay, and yet he doth not ſay all by abundance of what he could ſay, if you can believe him. But if you ſhould ask Mr. *James*, how he would prove what he hath ſaid? His anſwer is, Really it is not meet to name Perſons.

But what a moſt unhappy thing it is, if what he hath ſaid of the *Baptiſts* ſhould not be true: Why, you muſt take Mr. *James*'s Word for it, and then it is all as well proved, as all the reſt of the Slanders. And *Mr. James* aſſerts it again, *viz.* " So it is in truth; and forſooth the " Perſons would fain be accounted Innocent, and cry out " of the Wrong I have done them.

And truly, Sir, ſo they will do ſtill, unleſs you aſſign Names, and bring the Perſons to open trial that you have accuſed; and the Accuſers muſt appear and make good their Charge, otherwiſe all you have ſaid will be of little Value, your Labour loſt, and your Words called in queſtion, as indeed they are already.

But *Mr. James*, to ſtrengthen this Matter, will give you an Inſtance; *viz.* "One Inſtance I cannot but pro- " duce, and that a little largely, it being ſo material, and " I am glad (as the Caſe is) to take opportunity to let the " World know it.

Now that which he would have the World to know, is, that my Books are ſcattered amongſt them; " But ſurely " (ſaith he) the like was never known; for to this Book " of his they have laid another, and ſtitcht them together.

What a piece of Admiration here is! Well, *Mr. James*, admire them ſtill; but I hope the People that reads them will make better uſe of them, than to admire only; and

ſuch

such as have no prejudicate Opinion of them, may find them intelligible, notwithstanding your Slanders and Contempt.

In *Pag.* 18. we have another famous Instance of a Woman of near 40 Years of Age, *S. B.* which *Mr. James*, (as he saith) "Instructing her in the Principles of Christian Religion, *&c.* This Woman was also disturbed by "the *Baptists*, and that which seems worse is, that *G. E.* had "the confidence to tell *Mr. James* it was no Baptism, "(which makes *Mr. James* cry out) monstrous Doctrine! "what will become of Christians at this rate?

Why truly, I hope at this rate, it may put People upon the Inquiry, Whether the Baptism of Infants be the Baptism of Christ, or not? for indeed Sprinkling is not Baptizing, but Rantizing: *Aspergere*, is to besprinkle, or scatter abroad; and *Baptizo*, to dip, dive, or plunge under Water, and agrees with the Scripture, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. to be buried by Baptism, which Sprinkling will not admit of. But more of this in another place.

In *Pag.* 19. *Mr. James* cries out, "Thus to cavil! The "word Βαπτίζω chosen by Christ, and the Holy Ghost, "doth signify to wash as well as to dip; it signifies a washing with Water; not only a total Immersion, but a Partial; not only a Dipping, but other Applications of "Water to wash.

Well, Sir, I find you are so just as to grant that Dipping is Baptizing; and we grant that such a Washing is so likewise. But that Sprinkling is such a Washing, we utterly deny: Nor is it Baptizing, there is another Word for it in the Greek; and that which is proper in the Greek is *Rantizo*, which in English is to sprinkle; and it is not reasonable to make any other Application, than what was at first appointed, which is to be buried by Baptism. But Sprinkling is not burying, (and that every Man of common Sense understands) and but very sorry washing, such as will not be allowed for washing: and the Sprinkling you mention under the Law is of no use, therefore I shall pass it.

But, saith Mr. *James*, "From the Apostle I will learn "the meaning of the word, rather than follow any *Anabaptist*.

Sir,

Sir, if you learn of the Apostle, you must bury by Baptism, which you cannot do by Sprinkling: But Mr. *James* ridicules my Learning, and because I refer him to *Lexicons*, *Dictionaries*, and Authors that are Orthodox, the Gentleman would make sport of it as if the *Baptists* were so ignorant as not fit to name those Books, or speak of Authors; when God knows we are forced to take great Pains to search Books and Authors, with greater Diligence than were needful, were the Learned Men generally more fair, (tho some are, there are but few that be so) for instead of helping the Ignorant, they by Priest-craft darken Counsel, to carry on their own Ends.

But blessed be God Light is broke forth, that tho *not many Mighty, not many Noble*, yet some there are (by God's Providence) that no Flesh might glory, 1 *Cor.* 1. 27. And it is not the Haughty and the Proud, and such as hold poor Men in Contempt, that have all the Wisdom in Religious Matters.

But Mr. *James* scoffingly tells us, "Truly it is rare to "find a *Baptist*, tho he cannot read one word of Greek, "or understand Latin, and yet not to talk and write of the "Sense of Βαπτίζω, as tho they had consulted *Lexicons*, "*Dictionaries*, and what not?

And why so lofty to have poor Men in Contempt, that you think understand not Greek and Latin as you do? what must become of them, must they be answered only with Contempt?

For shame get more Humility, and meekly instruct those that oppose themselves, (when you meet with such) if you pretend to be a Minister of the Gospel.

But, "As tho we had consulted *Lexicons* and *Dictiona-*"*ries*, and what not; yes, Mr. *James* some of us do, and why not we as well as you? I presume you had your Learning by Education, (and not by Inspiration only) and so have we; and doubt not but to find enough to confute your Errors, especially your Infants Sprinkling, which neither by Inspiration nor Human Learning, ever yet appeared to be the Baptism of Christ.

But saith Mr. *James*, "Who ever yet denied Dipping to "be Baptizing? (so that he granted it) yet farther saith, "But Mr. *Wells*'s Friends at *Ashford* might be ashamed to "say no other application of Water is Baptizing.

No

No Mr. *James*, they need not be ashamed till you assign some other Application by Scripture-Authority; and you grant us Dipping, find Sprinkling if you can by any Authority of the Scripture, and we will give you the Cause.

But Mr. *James* in the 20*th* Page saith, " Indeed at the " rate some *Baptists* write, and report the words of the " Learned, they would perswade silly People all the " Learned Men were almost *Anabaptists*; yea, and " (αὐτοκατάκριτοι) Self-condemned, being as they are in " Opinion, tho of a contrary Practice.

No, Mr. *James*, not all the Learned, but many do as Mr. *James* himself doth; do not you say Dipping may be the best way of Baptizing, and yet practise the contrary? so that you confess the Truth, but by your Practice deny it; tho you say, " You have searched *Lexicons*, and *Dictiona-* " *ries*, and find the word rendered there Dip, but also to " wash, yea (say you) and to sprinkle, there comes in an " item, *Lavo*, *Abluo*. Now to wash by Dipping is certainly Baptizing, as you grant, but your *Item* to sprinkle will not do with the Antients.

But saith Mr. *James*, " I would fain know who can " prove our Lord Jesus himself was dipped or plunged in " his Baptism, or that any of those Baptized ones spoken " of in the New Testament, were so dipped or plunged? " not a word that ever I yet read did prove, I say, sound- " ly prove it; Probability is no Proof of this Degree, O- " pinion is not Faith.

Sir, you need not ask who can prove it, for, *first*, you have granted that Baptizing is to dip; but it is a Greek word, and is not Englished in our Translation; if it had, no doubt but we might have had the proper Sense as it is translated in *Holland*, *John* the *Dooper*, (i. e.) *John* the *Baptist*; so that when we turn the Greek into English, we ought to say *John* the *Dipper*.

Sir, do not quarrel with your self and the Scripture, and the several Authors that shall be assigned in their proper Places; you confess the Greek word *Baptizo*, is to dip; *2dly*, The Scripture tells you it is a Burial, *Rom.* 6. 4. *Col.* 2. 12. And I presume you cannot but know the Greek word *Rantizo*, is to sprinkle, and is as different from *Baptizo*, as dipping is from sprinkling in English; and every Man of an ordinary Capacity knows what that is, and this

you shall have soundly proved. And as you say Probability is no Proof, yet to serve a turn you make that do as well as you can; for you dare not say that Sprinkling of Infants is any more than Probability and Opinion, it is not Faith, so that you can have little Faith in the Matter, nor can you soundly prove it. Yet Mr. *James* saith, " An Im-" mersion might be, and yet not a total one, or it might " be by some other Applications.

Sir, pray assign those other Applications if you can, and what they were; for you confess that Baptism was performed by Dipping, so I hope you will say nothing against that any more, yet I see you would fain have some other way too; for you say, " But that there were other ways " is certain, also pray let Mr. *Wells* construe these words, " *fundere aquam*, *infundere*, and sometimes *lavare*, *abluere*, " found oftentimes in the Writings of the Antients, yea " and sometimes *aspergere*, for Baptizing. Well you say I must construe this, and to oblige you I will do what I can, and I pray take it thus, *fundere aquam*, is to pour out Water; *Infundere*, is to pour in or upon; *Lavare*, *abluere*, is to wash, or to wash off; and you say found often among the Antients, yea and sometimes *aspergere*, or cause to sprinkle, for Baptizing.

Sir, You assign none of the Antients that are Authentick, that say Sprinkling is Baptizing; but that dipping is, all do allow.

But Mr. *James* saith, " Let them unriddle how they bap-" tized some in Prisons, and in their Sick-Beds, of Fe-" vers, Sweats, *&c.*

I pray what is this to your purpose? what if they sprinkled as you do, (tho that doth not appear) is this a good Authority from Holy Writ? And as to your Fathers, and your Poets, they do not prove the Matter, but are little worth: and it is horrible Boldness in any to say, that Sprinkling of Infants is the Baptism of Christ.

But in the latter end of the 20*th*, and part of the 21*st* Pages, you recite an insignificant Poet, (who may pass for a Poet still) and *Bernard* a late Writer, who comes too late to do you any Service in this Case. I shall assign such as are more Antient in their due Places, and I hope to more purpose: For say you, " I do not produce these Testimo-" nies as tho I would maintain that our Lord Jesus was not " Dipped,

" Dipped, but only to shew the boldness of those Persons, " who cavil at the Baptism of all such as are not plun- " ged in the Water; and do, by crying up, *Dipped, or* " *damned*, trouble the Weak, and drive them into a dan- " gerous Melancholy.

I reply; If you will not be thought to maintain that our Lord Jesus was not dipped, do you not tacitly grant that he was dipped? And well you may, being of the Opinion it is the best way of Baptizing. Now if that be the best, it is no boldness to shew the Weakness of Infants Sprinkling, (that being but a mere humane Invention); but great boldness in those as assert it to be the Baptism of Christ.

But pray assign such as cry up *dipped, or damned*, that we may sharply reprove them, and teach them to read our Saviour's Words at length, *Mark* 16. 16. *He that believeth, and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned.* Now if these Words strike dread upon any, and drive them into a deep Melancholy, I hope it may bring them to a serious Consideration of their State and Condition, so as to see, that without Faith and Obedience, they are in danger of being damned: *For he will come in flaming Fire, taking vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Gospel of our Lord Jesus Christ*, 2 Thess. 1. 8. And when the Jews were struck with Terror, being *prickt in their Hearts, and said unto* Peter, *and the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, What shall we do?* Acts 2. 37, 38. *Then* Peter *said unto them, Repent, and be baptized*, &c.

Thus you see the Advice and Instruction that was given by *Peter*, to quiet the troubled Souls that were strucken with Terror: Now I hope a *Baptist* may not be blamed for such Instructions to any troubled Soul of the like kind.

But *Mr. James* saith, " He cannot but take notice of " Mr. *Wells*'s Confidence, to call Infant-Baptism a scrip- " tureless Notion, and that sprinkling of Infants is a scrip- " tureless thing.

Indeed I do so, and have Confidence to say it still, with submission to better Judgments. Now if *Mr. James* can shew Scripture for it, I shall submit; which if he can, why did he not do it before now? and then he had proved me to be as ignorant as he is pleased to call me. And indeed I am as ignorant, as *Mr. James* reads my Words,

(That) ſprinkling of Infants is a new Doctrine, and a ſcriptureleſs thing, and is not to be found from the beginning of *Geneſis*, to the end of the *Revelations*. At which *Mr. James* cries out, "What! a new Doctrine? Let famous *Calvin* be heard, *Pag.* 21.

And indeed he was a great Man, for what he could not do by Arguments, he did by Force and Cruelty. And *Calvin* may go in the number of one of *Mr. James*'s ſelf-condemned Men too; for he ſaith, upon *John* 3. 23. *And* John *alſo was baptizing in* Enon, *near to* Salim, (the Reaſon was) *becauſe there was much Water there.* Now *Calvin* upon theſe words ſaith; From this place you may gather, that *John* and Chriſt adminiſtred Baptiſm, by plunging the whole Body in Water.

See alſo another Text, *Acts* 8. 36. *As they went on their way, they came unto a certain Water; and the Eunuch ſaid, See, here is Water,* &c. Ver. 38. *And they went down both into the Water, both* Philip *and the Eunuch, and he baptized him.* Ver. 39. *And when they were come up out of the Water,* &c. Upon which place *Calvin* ſaith, "We ſee what a "Faſhion the Antients had to adminiſter Baptiſm; for "they plunged the whole Body into the Water; the Uſe "is now, (ſaith he) that the Miniſter caſt a few Drops on-"ly upon the Body, or upon the Head. So that Mr. *Calvin* confeſſes their Practice, and the Antients about Baptiſm, were very different.

The Aſſembly of Divines, upon *Acts* 8. 38. ſaith, They went down into the Water; and they were wont to dip the whole Body.

And upon *Rom.* 6. 4. they call it the Antient way of Baptiſm, which was, to dip the Parties baptized, and, as it were, to bury them under the Water for a while, and then draw them out of it, and lift them up, to repreſent the Burial of the Old Man.

And on *Mat.* 3. 6. (on the words) *were baptized*, ſay, they waſhed by dipping in *Jordan*.

And the *Common-Prayer*, or *Rubrick*, directs, He ſhall dip in the Water, diſcreetly and warily.

And Mr. *Diodate*, in his *Annotations* upon *Rom.* 6. 4. ſaith, (*viz.*) In Baptiſm being dipped in Water, according to the Antient Ceremony.

Mr.

Mr. *Thomas Wilson* in his *Dictionary* saith, "To baptize is "to dip into Water, or plunge one into the Water. And also saith, "Baptism without Faith in the Party bap- "tized, doth not work Grace. And again saith more fully thus, "It is the solemn dipping into, or washing in "Water at the Commandment of Christ, in the Name of "the Trinity.

Mr. *Thomas Grantham*, in his Friendly Epistle to the Bishops and Ministers of the Church of *England*, has the following Letter.

A Letter long since sent Mr. *J. Tombs*, B. D. upon occasion of his Learned Disputation, concerning the Restauration of Holy Baptism to its Primitive use; and written by that Reverend Man Dr. *Barlow*, now Lord Bishop of *Lincoln*; which *verbatim* is as follows.

I *Am a Friend to your Person, whom I have known, (though unknown to you this 31 Years) and to your Opinion too, (as to the Main of it); For I believe and know, that there is neither Precept nor Practice in the Scripture for Pedo-baptism, nor any just Evidence for it, for about two hundred Years after Christ. The first that bears Witness to Infant-Baptism practised in the Church, is* Tertullian; *but so as he expresly dislikes and condemns it as an unwarrantable and irrational Custom. And* Nazianzen, *a good while after him, in his Oration, dislikes it too, and would not have Infants brought to Baptism till some Age, and able to answer for themselves. Sure I am, that in the Primitive Times they were to be* Catechumeni, *and then* Illuminati, *or* Baptizati: *And this not only Children of Pagans, or Pagans converted, but Children of Christian Parents.*

Nazianzen, *though a Bishop's Son, being not baptized till he was about 30 Years of Age, as appears in his Life. And the like is evident in some others.*

The Truth is, Infant-Baptism (how or by whom I know not) came in in the second Century; and in the Third and Fourth began to be practised, though not generally; and defended as lawful, from that Text (grosly misunderstood) John 3. 5. *Upon the like gross Mistake of* John 6. 53. *they did for many Centuries, both in the Greek and Latin Churches, communicate Infants, and give them the Lord's Supper; but I do confess they might do both as well as either. But although they baptized some*

 Infants,

Infants, and thought it lawful so to do, yet Augustine *was the Man that ever said it was necessary*, inde durus Pater Infantum. *I have seen what my Learned and Worthy Friend Dr.* Hammond, *Mr.* Baxter, *and others, say in defence of it; and I confess I wonder not a little, that Men of such Parts should say so much to so little purpose, for I have not seen any thing like an Argument for it.*

And Dr. *Taylor* tells us, There is no Primitive Tradition for Infants Baptism. See his *Dissuasive from Popery.*

And Mr. *Baxter*, a very eminent Man of your Way, and a great Asserter of Infant-Baptism, in his Book called, *The second Disputation of Right to Sacraments*, Pag. 149, 150. in his 16*th* Argument, he speaking of the Commission, *Mat.* 28. saith, the first is to make Disciples or Believers, and then the second Work is to baptize them, and then to teach in the farther knowledg of Christ: Nay and farther saith, that to contemn this Order, is to contemn all Rules of Order.

And furthermore saith, that in my Conscience it is one sort of Faith, even saving, that must go before Baptism, the Profession whereof the Administrator must expect. Nay and that it is ridiculous and impious to admit any without it; nay, a high Profanation.

And in his plain Scripture Proof, *Page* 24. saith, he wonders that Men dare go in a Way that hath neither Precept nor Example in the Scripture to warrant it, from a Way that hath full Current of both: yet they that admit Members otherwise than by Repentance and Faith, do so.

Mr. *Baxter* in his Saints Rest, *Part* 1. *Chap.* 8. *Sect.* 5. saith these words (*viz.*) "That *Tertullian*, *Origen* and *Cyprian*, who lived (saith he) in the second and third Cen" tury, do all of them affirm, that in the Primitive "Times none were baptized without an express Covenant" ing, wherein they renounced the World, the Flesh and "the Devil, and engaged themselves to Christ, and promi" sed to obey him.

And in his 10*th* Argument, *Page* 117, 118. saith, "Christ "hath instituted no Baptism, but what is a sign of preser" Regeneration, therefore he hath instituted no Baptism "to be administred to such, and he quotes *John* 3. 5. *Ti*

" 3. 5. An

And in his 20*th* Argum. to Mr. *Blake*, in these words, " here " note, saith he, (speaking of the *Eunuch*'s not being admit- " ted to Baptism till he made a Profession of his Faith)

" 1. Baptism as received is the Seal of our Faith, (how " much soever denied by Mr. *Blake*) as it is the Seal of " God's Promise.

" 2. The constant Order is, that Baptism follow Faith.

" 3. That it is no better than an impious Profanation " of it if it go without Faith, that is, first, if the Party " seek it without the presence of Faith; and secondly, if " the Pastor administer it without the Profession of Faith.

And again in his Book, *Scripture-Proof*, &c. (which is in Contradiction to the Title of his Book) *Page* 3. he confesseth that Infants-Baptism is not plainly determined in the Scriptures.

And Dr. *Towerson*, in the Explication of the Catechism of the Church of *England*, *Par.* 4. *Pag.* 20. tho he was a strong Asserter of Infants-Baptism, saith thus, " One other Particu- " lar there is, in which Baptism is intended as a Sign, and " that is in respect of the manner of *Application* used, I mean " the Dipping or Plunging the Party Baptized in it; a sig- " nification which St. *Paul* will not suffer those to for- " get, who have been acquainted with his Epistles; for " with reference to that manner of Baptizing, we find " him affirming, *Rom.* 6. 4. that *we are Buried with Christ by Baptism into Death; that like as Christ was raised up from the Dead, by the Glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of Life.* And again, *ver.* 5. that as *we have been planted together in the likeness of his Death, we shall be also in the likeness of his Resurrection.* To the same purpose, or rather yet clearly doth that Apostle discourse, where he tells us, *Col.* 2. 12. that *we are Buried with Christ in Baptism, so we do therein Rise also with him in the Faith of the Operation of God, who hath raised him from the Dead:* for what " is this but to say, that the design of Baptism was to " oblige Men to conform so far to the Death and Resur- " rection of Christ, as to die unto Sin, and live again unto " Righteousness, so it was perform'd by the Ceremony of " Immersion, that the Person immersed might by that Cere- " mony (which was no obscure Image of a Sepulture) be " minded of the precedent Death, as in like manner by " his coming again out of the Water, of his rising from

" that Death to Life, after the Example of the Instituter " thereof.

And then he tells you, " The Antient Church added to " the Rite of Immersion, the Dipping the Party three " several Times.

But by Antient Church he cannot mean the Primitive Church, for that he saith they added the Rite.

But a little after he puts a Question about Baptism, how it ought to be applied, *viz.*

" Whether it ought to be applied by an Immersion, or " an Aspersion, or Effusion.

To which he gives answer.

" It may be a more material Question than is com- " monly deemed by us who have been accustomed to bap- " tize by a bare Effusion and Sprinkling of Water upon " the Party.

" For things which depend for the force, on the meer " Will and Pleasure of him who instituted them, there " ought no doubt great regard to be had to the Com- " mands of him who did so, as without which there is no " reason we should receive the Benefit of that Ceremony " to which he has been pleased to annex it. Now what " the Command of Christ was in this particular cannot be " well doubted of by those who shall consider, first, the " words of Christ, *Mat.* 28. 19. concerning it, and the " Practice of those Times, whether in the Baptism of " *John* or our Saviour; for the words of Christ are, that " they should Baptize or Dip those whom they made Di- " sciples to him; for so no doubt the word " properly signifies: and which is more, and not without " its weight, that they should baptize them in the Name " of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; " thereby intimating such a washing as should receive the " Party Baptized with, in the Body of that Water, which " they were to baptize him withal; tho if there could be " any doubt concerning the Signification of the words " themselves, yet would that Doubt be remov'd by consider- " ing the Practice of those Times, whether in the Baptism " of *John*, or our Saviour; for such was the Practice of those " Times in Baptizing; such in reason we are to think our " Saviour's Command to have been concerning it, especi- " ally when the words themselves incline that way, there

" being

" being not otherwise any Means either for those or fu-
" ture Times to discover his Intention concerning it.
" Now what the Practice of those Times were as to the
" particular, will need no other Proof, than the resorting
" to Rivers and other such Receptacles of Waters for the
" Performance of that Ceremony, as that because there
" was much Water there; for so the Scripture doth only
" affirm concerning the Baptism of *John*, *Mat.* 3. 5.
" *John* 3. 23. but doth not intimate concerning that which
" our Saviour administred in *Judea*, because making *John's*
" Baptism and his to be so far forth of the same sort,
" *John* 3. 22, 23. and expresly affirming concerning the
" Baptism of the Eunuch, which is the only Christian
" Baptism the Scripture is any thing particular in the De-
" scription of; the words of St. *Luke*, *Acts* 8. 38. being
" that both *Philip* and the Eunuch went down into a cer-
" tain Water, (which they met with in their Journey)
" in order to a baptizing of the latter. For what would
" there have been of the Baptist's resorting to great con-
" fluxes of Water, or of *Philip's* and the Eunuch's going
" down into this, were it not that the Baptism both of
" the one and the other was to be performed by an Im-
" mersion; a very little Water, as we know it doth with
" us, sufficing for an Effusion or Sprinkling? But besides
" the words of our Blessed Saviour, and the current
" Practice of those Times wherein this Sacrament was
" Instituted, it is in my Opinion of no less Consideration,
" that the thing signified by the Sacrament of Baptism,
" cannot otherwise be well represented, than by an Im-
" mersion, or at least by some more general way of
" Purification, than that of Effusion or Sprinkling; for
" tho the Pouring or Sprinkling a little Water upon the
" Face, may suffice to represent an internal Washing,
" which seems to be the general end of Christ's making
" use of the Sacrament of Baptism, yet cannot be thought
" to represent such an intire Washing as that of new-
" born Infants was: And as Baptism may seem to have
" been intended for it, because represented as the Laver
" of our Regeneration, *Tit.* 3. 8. that tho it do require an
" Immersion, yet requiring such a general Washing at
" least, as may extend to the whole Body, as other than
" which cannot answer its Type; nor yet the general, tho

" ternal

" internal Purgation which Baptism was intended to re-
" present. The same is to be said yet more upon the
" Account of our conforming to the Death and Resur-
" rection of Christ, which we learn from St. *Paul* to have
" the design of Baptism to signify; for tho that might
" and was well enough represented by the Baptized Per-
" sons being Buried in Baptism, and their rising out of it,
" yet can it not be said to be so, or at least but very im-
" perfectly by the bare Pouring out, or Sprinkling the
" baptismal Water on him. But therefore as there is so
" much the more Reason to represent the Rite of Immer-
" sion as the only Legitimate Rite of Baptism, because
" the only one that can answer the Ends of its Institution,
" and those things which were to be signified by it; so e-
" specially, if (as is well known, and undoubtedly of
" great force) the general Practice of the Primitive
" Church was agreeable thereto, and the Greek Church to
" this very day; for who can think either the one or the
" other, would have been so tenacious of so troublesome
" a Rite, were it not that they were well assured, as they
" of the Primitive Church might very well be, of its be-
" ing the only Instituted and Legitimate one?

Thus you see this Learned Man is forced to confess against himself, that the Institution of Christ was to dip, plunge, or bury the whole Body in the Water, and only of such as made a profession of their Faith; and that Sprinkling could not be intended for the Baptism of Christ, nor that Infants could be the Subjects of it.

And in the very next Paragraph tells you, (*viz.*) " How
" to take off the force of the Arguments altogether, is a
" thing I mean not to consider, partly because our Church
" (see the Rubrick in the Office of Baptism before the
" words, *I baptize thee*) seem to perswade such an Immersion;
" and partly because I cannot but think the forementioned
" Arguments to be so far of Force, as to evince the ne-
" cessity thereof, where there is not some greater necessity
" to occasion an Alteration of it: for what Benefit can
" Men ordinarily expect from that which depends for its
" Force upon the Will of him that instituted it, where
" there is no such Compliance at the least with it, and the
" Command of the Instituter, as may answer those Ends
" for which he applied it?

I presume many may give credit to that Learned and Pious Man Dr. *Du-Veil*, who writ a literal Explanation of the *Acts of the Apostles* in Latin, and translated it into English, 1684. And upon *Acts* the 8*th* and 37. "If thou believest that the Eunuch was not permitted to be baptized, unless he had professed a sincere Faith in Christ, it doth sufficiently enough (saith he) declare how truly great *Basil* has spoken in his Book on the *Holy Spirit*, Chap. 12. Faith and Baptism are the two Means of Salvation, inseparably cleaving together; for Faith is perfected by Baptism, but Baptism is founded by Faith, and by the same Names both things are fulfilled: For as we believe in the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, *&c.* indeed there goeth before a Confession, leading us to Salvation; but Baptism follows, sealing our Confession and Covenant.

Having said as above, *If thou believest*, &c. after he had spoken to that, adds, "With all the Heart, that is, with an earnest Desire of thy Heart, and unfeigned Faith. And after that saith, "Thou mayest: Hence may we gather (saith he) how absurd their Opinon is, who think that by Baptism, Faith is produced in Infants new born, and destitute of the use of Reason; for if Baptism cannot do it in those that are come to Years, it can much less do it in Infants. Neither can it be said, except very absurdly, that they do believe in Christ, or in his Gospel, when there does not even appear the least shadow of Faith in them; they do not know their Parents by any Token, and know not what difference there is between Right and left Hand; how then are they able to understand the least thing of the Mysteries of the Kingdom of Heaven, which are the Objects of our Faith? They do not consent to any Humane things, can they then assent unto Divine things?

Ver. 38. "*And they went both down into the Water, both* Philip *and the Eunuch*, (*i. e.*) both he that was to baptize, and he that was to be baptized, *went down into the Water*, because he ought not only to sprinkle him with Water, but to dip him in the Water, Christ commanding βαπτισμὸν Dipping, but not ῥαντισμὸν Sprinkling.

But

But I may say, as Mr. *James* doth in *Pag.* 23. toward the latter end; "I grow weary of writing; and indeed "this is the great Mischief Mr. *Wells* hath done me, he "hath created me some Trouble, and many Thoughts, "whereas my Hands are full enough of Work, the Work "of my Ministry; not being so happy as many of them, "to mind a Flock, a Family, and a Trade also, and yet "find time for Disputing, Printing, and what not, *&c.*

Sir, Had not you created this Trouble to your self, and busied your Thoughts to print, and publish to the World those gross and scandalous Slanders which you can never prove, you might not have heard of me, nor wearied your self to write on this Matter; for it was you that gave the Trouble to those that were at Peace. And whereas you say, your Hands are full enough of the Work of your Ministry, why did you not keep to it? It is to be feared, that being Idle, you became Wanton, and were willing to play Tricks with your Neighbours, to shew your Parts, that the World might see how much you excel others: But this pleasing Comedy may end in a Tragedy, unless you mourn for your Folly. Had you taken the Apostle *Paul*'s Advice and Instructions he gave to the Elders of *Ephesus*, Acts 20. 17, to the *36th* Verse, you might have been much better imployed, than to have been sending and proving amongst your Neighbours, and to charge Crimes upon such as you are displeased with, when you cannot prove any Matter of Fact: Yet, saith he, I can do it, but must not let you know their Names, for that may be injurious to them. Which if it be so, pray take it all upon your self, and see who will believe you.

Sir, I remember you told me at *Ashford*, that this Matter might disparage or disgrace you (or Words to that effect) to Posterity. And indeed I doubt it may, without a better Vindication: Yet if you lay aside your Levity, or lightness of Carriage, and become more grave and cool in your Temper, and not lofty and haughty, but of an humble Disposition, and not answering with Contempt, but with soft Answers appease Wrath; and *be gentle towards all Men, meekly instructing those that oppose themselves*, 2 Tim. 2. 24, 25. and this is the Duty of an ordained Minister, as you say you are: then as a Bishop, take the over-sight of your Flock; and as an Elder, see that you

rule

rule well; and as a Pastor feed the Flock, all which being well done, you may keep your self fully imployed, that you might not disturb your Neighbours; and then the Controversy might die in time: And had you not too much insulted, and boasted of your great Learning, slighting and condemning others with opprobrious Language, as not only ignorant, but foul and unfair, bold, impudent, lying, and what not; but used better Language, you might and would have much better adorned your Discourse. But by that time you come to my Age, I hope you will learn more Modesty, and get more Solidity: but young Men are full of Blood, which causes Heat; and a Novice may be lifted up with Pride, if great heed be not taken.

But Mr. *James* saith, "He is not so happy as many, to "mind a Flock, and Family, and a Trade also. Which indeed if he had, he might not have been so wanton: For had he had a Trade, and been diligent, he, like the Apostle, might have covered no Man's Silver, or Gold, or Apparel; *but his Hands might have ministred to his Necessities, and them that were with him*, Acts 20. 33, 34. & 1 Cor. 4. 12. we see the Apostle was exposed to hardship for the Gospel's sake, *Ver.* 11, 12. *Having no certain dwelling-place; labour, working with our own Hands*, &c. And in 1 *Thess.* 2. 9. *For ye remember, Brethren, our Labour and Travel: for labouring Night and Day, because we would not be chargeable unto any of you, we preached unto you the Gospel of God.* Likewise in 2 *Thess.* 3. 8, 9. *Neither did we eat any Man's Bread for nought, but wrought with labour and travel Night and Day, that we might not be chargeable to any of you: Not because we have not Power, but to make our selves an Example unto you to follow us.* Thus you see, that Tradesmen that can preach and pray, and serve the Church, and follow their Trades too, and diligently do so, follow *Paul*'s Example; that so labouring they may support the Weak. And (blessed be God) I have known some among us so happy as to do so, tho not Tent-makers like *Paul*, yet Taylors and other Tradesmen, whose Sincerity and Integrity, with great diligence, have carried them through great Difficulties in the Service of God; and by the Blessing of God, have exceeded many Wise and Learned Men, that would answer only with Contempt.

In

In *Pag.* 24. you seem to take care of your People, being (as you say) set for the Defence of the Gospel, (with many other Words that I pass over for brevity's sake); but if you so preach the Gospel, (that is, *glad tidings of Peace to all Men*) and keep the Ordinances, as they were delivered in their Primitive Purity, I hope we shall give you no interruption: But then be not angry with such who obey the Truth, as you seem to be with *E. G.* "Who was but a little while under your Care, and "was so suddenly gone, that you were scarce aware of "it, (as you say) and it was but once you had oppor- "tunity to speak to him before he was dipped, and then "he utterly refused my Offer to discourse with those *Ana-* "*baptists* in his presence, for his sake, *&c.* And this you offer as part of your *Vindication*.

But *E. G.* saith, he spoke to you several times before he was dipped, and never refused to discourse, and is ready to justify the same; Nor was he rashly dipt, but upon mature and serious consideration, being sensible of his Duty. Now if this be so, this mightily weakens your *Vindication* in this Point; and that he is in the right, and you in the wrong, he is ready to justify at any time.

But it seems there was another of your Hearers (who as you say) "being dipped, lamented with Tears, that "she must leave such good Preaching. I pray how came you to fancy so? your saying so, moved me to ask her the Question; and take her own Testimony, which is thus:

"I do say, I know nothing that ever I spake to Mr. "*James*, (since I was baptized) or any thing like that, "of being any-ways troubled to leave his Preaching; but "am well satisfied ever since I was joined with them, of "what I have done, (*meaning the Baptists*); neither was "I, nor could I be satisfied in my Conscience, whilst I "were a Hearer of Mr. *James*, seeing he could not satisfy "me from the Word of the Lord, that Infants Sprinkling "was sufficient Baptism: Tho I do not say but I liked "his Preaching well, but all his Reasons did not satisfy "my Conscience. *And further said*; It was neither Fa- "ther nor Mother troubled me, nor caused Tears from "me, but my own Conscience, and God's Word, per- "swaded me to leave Mr. *James*, and practise what I

"did

" did believe before; tho I would fain have gone with my " Husband, but I had no Peace in my Conscience so to do. " And this I testify, *M. R.*

Thus doth one that was your Member, and another that was your Hearer, somewhat weaken your Vindication. But why all your Hearers should not be your Members, if they please, I know not; for their being sprinkled in their Infancy, makes them Members.

In *Pag.* 25. Mr. *James* saith, " One thing more and I " conclude: Whereas Mr. *Wells* makes a Challenge to " dispute with me, in his *Reply*, especially in his pri- " vate Letter, I am afraid it would be but a spending " Time idely, to argue with that Man, who knows not " how to put the Question fairly he would dispute upon.

Sir, Pray what doth discourage you, seeing you deem me a Man so weak? had you not the greater Advantage to make me appear to be such as you imagine? Alas! this Sham will never take with a judicious Reader.

In the next place Mr. *James* saith; " His second Offer " is this: Secondly, We are ready to try the Cause, Whe- " ther Dipping or Sprinkling be most Antient.

I confess I put the Question so, and I will stand by it: And the Question is fairly put, If you pretend to make Sprinkling as Antient as Dipping; or if you say Dipping is a new Doctrine.

You told me at *Ashford* it was not fit to be discoursed, nor would you dispute it; allowing (if I understand you) Dipping to be most Antient: And since you do allow it, that may be laid aside; but then let it be remembred, that you give us the Point, that Dipping is most Antient.

This was indeed the second Proposition; But how came you to lose the First? Which we are not willing to pass over; and to bring it to your Memory, it was thus; That we do demand Satisfaction of you, for the several Scandals and Slanders that (we say) you have unjustly laid upon us, and this ought to be done first. And the Second being laid aside on the Terms aforesaid, let us come to the Third, which is, That we deny sprinkling of Infants to be the Baptism of Christ. And, 4*thly*, that we are ready to prove that Dipping is Baptizing, and that by Christ's Institution.

But

But since Mr. *James* has set me aside for my Weakness, I shall endeavour to oblige him with a better Scholar, that can distinguish well between *Baptizo* and *Rantizo*, (*i.e.*) Dipping and Sprinkling.

But Mr. *James* further saith; "But what, I pray, would "this come to? Who speaks against the Antiquity of Dip- "ping? But was it a total Immersion, a Dipping the "whole Person?

Yea, sure, for Baptism is to dip, and you grant it; and the Scripture calls it *a Burial*, Rom. 6. 4. Col. 2. 12. Now can you be said to bury a Person, if you leave out a Hand or a Foot, nay, the whole Body, and only sprinkle a little Dust on the Face? The most ignorant and weak, that have but any Sense, will not say that is a Burial. But, saith Mr. *James*, "If Christ gives his Churches liberty to bap- "tize, by pouring on Water, or other Application— That was well put in, *If he do so:* But where will you find that? I confess the Church of *Rome* doth say, He has left that, and many other things, to the Discretion of the Church; and they profess to baptize their Infants upon no other score. But I believe them no more than I do you. And when you find Sprinkling, or other Applications, to be the Baptism of Christ, shew a Word of the Lord for it, and you shall be believed. But why should a little Water be applied to the Face only? why not to the Hand, or the Foot, or any other part of the Body (if at liberty)? But this is piteous Stuff to imagine.

I have seen the *Lexicons*, Mr. *James*, and there 'tis properly *to dip*, as you grant, and that it is the best way of baptizing: For these are your own words, *Dipping might be in Christ's Time, yea, and that the best way of baptizing.* Now this is honestly said of Mr. *James*, that 'tis the best way of baptizing. But how is it that Mr. *James* doth not, or will not use the best? For shame never seek for any other than the best, for that must needs be worse, and will make void the Commandment of God. And as in *Mark* 7. 8. *For laying aside the Command of God, ye hold the Tradition of Men.* And in the 9th Verse, *Full well ye reject the Commandments of God, that ye may keep your own Traditions.* And in *Mat.* 15. 9. *But in vain do they worship me, teaching for Doctrine the Commandments of Men,* (which is worst). But Mr. *James* grants Dipping to be the best way of Baptizing:

And

And the Truth is he is in the right of it, for any other must be the Tradition of Men; for there is but *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*, Ephes. 4. 5.

Yet Mr. *James* says, "In some Cases of Necessity things "may be done that are not lawful; (so that it seems tho Sprinkling be not lawful, yet Necessity may make it so) "in Case of Necessity Men might break the Sabbath, and "eat the Passover on another Month and Day than God "instituted it; and so in Case of Dipping. And indeed the Church of *England* doth say, If it be well certified, that if the Child be weak, they may pour Water on it, but not else, (but you hear of never a Word of God for it): Yet upon this Liberty it seems all are weak *now*; for I have not heard of a Child that has been dipped by the Priests for many Years, nor Water poured upon it, but by Sprinkling, which is but sorry pouring of Water.

But was the Woman weak that Mr. *James* sprinkled, who was about forty Years of Age? But she might be so, for ought I know, and all the rest that he sprinkles, for I hear of none that he has dipped, tho he allows it may be the best way of Baptizing.

And truly it is very unhappy, and great weakness too, that the best way of Baptizing should be wholly laid aside. I pray God forgive them, and bring them to the antient Purity of the Gospel, and to the good old Way, that they may walk therein.

But to the fourth Proposition; We are ready to prove, that Dipping is Baptizing; and that it is according to Christ's Institution. Mr. *James* saith, "This indeed will "require no great proof; and Mr. *Wells* may manage "this no doubt. I thank Mr. *James*, that he will allow, that a Man of such weak Parts as I am, may manage this undoubtedly: Well, having granted that, I have no need to prove any more in this Point. Yet Mr. *James* calls to mind the third Proposition; and that is, Whether Sprinkling of Infants be the Baptism of Christ. And this saith *Mr. James*, "Mr. *Wells* roundly denies, and indeed I do so. But then *Mr. James* saith, "I think it will not be worth "my while to dispute with Mr. *Wells*, of whom I do not "know (nor doth he make it appear) that he has the "least Learning that might be a means to keep him in "order, *&c.*

Sir, I dare not boast of my Learning; but you know as much of me, as I do of you: And the Truth fears no Strangers, nor seeks no Corners, nor need it be ashamed to appear publickly, whenever there is occasion: And if I am bold and confident, it is the Truth makes me so, for otherwise I am timorous enough; but have experienced how the Truth has holpen me in time past, to deal with as great and as learned Men as Mr. *James*, no disparagement to him: And I am apt to think, I have managed as many Disputes as ever Mr. *James* hath done; and he that convinceth me of Error, I take to be my best Friend.

But since Mr. *James* hath me in contempt to so great a Degree, I hope to please him with a greater Scholar, such an one as that Greek and Hebrew may not sound harsh in his Ears, (if he desires it) and I wish their Scholarship keep them in good Order: But if your Qualifications in Grace, Humility, Meekness, Sobriety and Moderation, with all due submission to the Truth, when made apparent, will not keep you in good Order, without Heats and Passions, I doubt all your Art and Skill in Learning will not: For there be many Learned Men that are haughty, proud, and imperious; and being Scholars, are lifted up with Pride, and boast of their Learning; and those that will not believe what they say to be true, they hold in Contempt, as not worthy to be discoursed with. But alas! what must the unlearned, and weak, and such as want Education in Schools of Learning do? Must they be slighted and contemned for want of Art, and Skill, and Learning in the Tongues of Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, and the like? surely this would be very unmerciful and unreasonable. But God be blessed, he hath Mercy on the Ignorant, the Poor and the Weak, that are unskilful in Arts, and are not Logicians by Art, nor can sophistically seem to be what they are not; yet God hath made them reasonable Souls, and many of them receive the Truth of the Gospel, and obey the same, when the Wise and the Learned hold them in contempt, and reject the Truth, as *the Pharisees and Lawyers rejected the Counsel of God against themselves, being not baptized of* John, *Luke* 7. 30.

But Mr. *James* saith; "If Mr. *Wells* have so much leisure, "and his Zeal be so great as to bring him to *Ashford*, and "my

" my Circumſtances fairly admit it, I will not ſay but I " may meet him upon this Score.

Sir, My Zeal was ſuch, and to oblige you, I did come to *Aſhford*; and after a few Days I ſent to you to let you know I was at your Service if you deſired it, to diſcourſe thoſe Matters, to which I have made ſome Reply, in anſwer to your Book. Upon which you immediately ſent for me, and I did accordingly attend on you: But your Reception was not ſo affable and friendly as I might have expected; for your Countenance was auſtere, and your Words foul, ſaying, I had printed Lies; with other unkind Reflections: Which I praiſe God I can bear, tho I thought my Age (if not my Learning) might have required a ſmoother Carriage.

But, in ſhort, your Anſwer was, Your Book was in the Preſs; and if *that* were not a full Anſwer, you would diſpute. I asked you when I might have it; you ſaid you expected it next Friday, but you were not certain: And I ſtaid about a Month, there, and there-abouts, and deſpaired of it, that is to ſay, at leaſt while I was there: But as I was mounting my Horſe, you ſent your Book; which I received, and went out of Town, being Friday, and returned the Monday following; in which time I could not much conſult your Book. But ſince I have, I find your Anſwer (or *Vindication*, as you call it) very foul, ſcandalous and unfair; in which I am greatly aſperſed and beſpattered, and am rendred the moſt inſipid piece of Ignorance that ever printed; and to ſpeak Truth, I have met with more civility from the Scolds at *Billingſgate*, than from Mr. *James*: Yet I think not my ſelf diſparaged thereby: let it return from whence it came, I am no way provoked thereby to be uneaſy, nor the leſs friendly to Mr. *James*, if it ſhould fall in my way to have any Converſation with him; only I take it for granted, that I am ſet aſide by Mr. *James* for a Diſputant, or for ſo publick a Diſcourſe as I expected. But I hope I may be there, and have the Honour to hear the Diſpute, if any ſuch thing ſhould happen. And when Mr. *James* ſhall deſire it, I hope I may obtain the Favour of ſome Gentleman that is a Scholar ſutable to his Quality, if that will pleaſe him better.

Mr. *James* cannot perſwade himſelf that I am any ways fit to diſcourſe him. Take his own Words for it, *viz.*

" To give him an Anſwer : But ſtill I muſt profeſs, I " am yet afraid of this, and cannot but perſwade my ſelf, " that if it ſhould come to a Trial, Mr. *Wells* would ar- " gue much after the ſame manner he writes (*i. e.*) " poorly and fouly, not handſomely nor honeſtly, being " over-confident of what he hath no ground for ; and ſo " he would create abundance of trouble to me, and per- " plex the Matter he takes in hand.

Dear Mr. *James*, why in ſuch an Agony ? and why ſuch a Dread upon your Spirits, as to profeſs to be afraid, and to perſwade your ſelf that you ſhould meet with ſuch ill uſage from me.

Now I do as ſeriouſly profeſs, and do perſwade my ſelf, that had you come to a Trial, you would not have out-done me for Moderation, and coolneſs of Temper. Nor ſhould I have perplext you, if your own Paſſions did not. And why fouly ? not handſomely nor honeſtly. Why ſurely you have a very prejudicate Opinion of me ? But if I am thus prejudged by you, it will be hard for Mr. *James* to believe me, when I ſpeak the Truth ; but I hope I have not, nor ſhall not give Occaſion to any to be thus cenſorious of me, whatever Mr. *James* may think ; and he doth but think ſo yet, for had he tried me, he might have known me better.

But Mr. *James* (I thank him) prevents the Trial of it, that it might not create abundance of trouble, and I find Mr. *James* is not for any trouble but what he makes himſelf. I am ſure he hath given me a great deal, and I ſhould not think it worth my pains, *but for the Truth's ſake* ; for rather than that ſhould ſuffer by Mr. *James*'s Slanders, ſlightings and contempt of an innocent People, and to be ridiculed in general Terms, to the Diſhonour of God, and the Truth that we profeſs, I ſhall yet have more at his Service if occaſion be, to bring him to diſcover the Offenders (if any be) that they may be admoniſhed, and dealt with as the Merit of the Cauſe requires ; which is all that we deſire in that Caſe, that ſo the Innocent may be acquitted : And until this is done, Mr. *James* ſtands charged, unleſs he make a publick Acknowledgment ; which is highly reaſonable, (whatever he may think of it) for he only occaſioned this Controverſy, and has charged upon the *Baptiſts* the things he cannot (or at leaſt

leaſt doth not) prove. And until he doth it, muſt be accounted a bold Preſumption in him to diſturb and abuſe an innocent People, that are willing to be at Peace with him and all Men, that are not offended with the Truth; at which if any will be offended, we ſhall labour to ſupport it, but only by the Word of God, and not by Art and Skill of Humane Tradition; for we *have renounced the hidden things of Diſhoneſty, not walking in Craftineſs, nor handling the Word of God deceitfully, but by manifeſtation of the Truth, commending our ſelves to every Man's Conſcience in the ſight of God*, 2 Cor. 4. 2.

For indeed Religion is not a piece of Wit and Subtilty, but according to the plain Declaration of the Goſpel of Peace; for it is not placed in the Clouds of Imagination, nor wrapt up in Myſtical Clothing, but is eaſy and intelligible to the Weak, and was preached by Fiſher-men and Mechanicks without inticing Speeches, and vain Speculations, addreſt to Babes and Plebeians, and deſigned to govern the Wills of the Honeſt and Sincere: I ſay it is not a piece of Wit or Subtilty to be a Chriſtian, it is not to exerciſe the Wits of the Notional and Curious, nor will it require much ſtudy to learn the Religion we muſt and ought to practiſe; get but good and honeſt Hearts, and be truly humbled for your Sins, and ſincerely repent of the ſame, believing in the Lord Jeſus Chriſt according to his Goſpel, and then obey, and this brings us under the Promiſe that ſaith, He that believeth and is baptized ſhall be ſaved; but the direful Doom of the unbelieving is, that he that believeth not ſhall be Damned, *i. e.* the Stubborn and Rebellious, to whom Chriſt will come in flaming Fire, taking Vengeance on them that know not God, and obey not the Goſpel of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, 2 *Theſſ.* 2. 8, 9.

Mr. *James* concludes the 26*th* Page in theſe words, "I "do forgive Mr. *Wells* the wrong he has done me, only "deſiring him not to act ſo raſhly for the future, judging "a Cauſe and condemning a Perſon he is ſo wholly a Stran-"ger to. As for my Neighbours who ſtirred him up, and "were ſo eager for ſome Body to print againſt me, and "gave ſuch falſe Witneſs, I freely forgive them alſo, only "deſire them to mind their own Buſineſs and be quiet, "above all to beware how they be concerned in printing, "leſt they prejudice their own Cauſe, and bring Shame

" and Disgrace upon themselves and their Brethren also.

Sir, Had you forgiven me any wrong I had done you, I should have taken it kindly, but you have not assigned any in your Vindication that carries any weight with it; but you suggest many foul things, and that very scurrilously, without any just Grounds: Nor did I act or judg rashly in any Matter or Cause that concerned you; for tho you were a Person wholly a Stranger to me, yet I were not a Stranger to your Book which you had published to the whole World, that all might read it that pleased, and which I did; and upon the Perusal of the same, I found just Cause to enquire after such as you charge with grievous and heinous Crimes; and these Persons, you say, are the *Baptists*, but who they are of them you do not assign, nor indeed can you, for ought that I can find as yet: But if you do, you may acquit your self to some degree, though not fully, having bespattered the whole People. And, I pray, what Wrong have I done you in enquiring after the Criminals?

And then for your Neighbours, that you say stirred me up, and gave such false Witness, you freely forgive them also. And truly, were there Truth in what you said, in giving false Witness, I hope they would take it kindly also. But your pretended Kindness is to make the World believe they had done you much Wrong, in bearing false Witness against you: All which is a great Piece of Deceit, for I had no Occasion of them for Evidence to prove how you had slandered an innocent People, your Book being so full of it; and the Wrong you pretend to be done by the *Baptists*, appears no other yet but a lewd Suggestion of your own. And whereas you desire them to mind their own Business and be quiet, I presume they do mind their Business, and would be glad to be quiet; and had not you disquieted them, by abusing of them, you might not have heard of any of the Controversy now depending: But you have kindled the Fire, and blown up the Coals into a Flame; and if you please to quench it, you must fully prove your Charge, or acknowledg your Miscarriage, whether it be wilful or thro mistake, (for they need not fear prejudicing their own Cause, and bringing Shame and Disgrace to themselves and their Brethren, by printing, to discover Truth) and that is all we demand for Satisfaction.

An

An Answer to Mr. *James*'s Postscript.

I Come now to examine Mr. *James*'s *Postscript*, in which he saith, *It may be some, through Ignorance, may think Mr.* Wells's *Reply is not fully answered*, &c. And then begins thus.

" In his Epistle to the Reader (near the End) there " is a Sarcastical Passage, reflecting upon the *Presbyteri-* " *ans* in general: But tho it be hard, yet being nothing " to our Purpose, only a Piece of Railery, *&c.*

Sir, Sarcastical is a hard word, and it is as much as to say a biting Taunt, or scoffing nippingly; which if I do so, let the Reader judg: My Words are these, But if all this will not do, it is to be feared he is of the rigid sort of *Presbytery*, and no Man need say worse. And this Mr. *James* calls a Reflecting on the *Presbyterians* in general, when in expres Terms I refer to the rigid Sort only; which are those of a persecuting Spirit, such as *Calvin*, who procured the burning of *Servetus*; and such rigid Ones as those in *New-England*, that have imprisoned and whip'd the *Baptists* even to death; and this I hope will not include the *Presbyterians* in general, for I presume there are a sort of them that are zealous for the Truth, to the best of their Knowledg, and not of that persecuting Spirit, but sober, grave, and temperate, doing as they would be done unto: And I wish Mr. *James* had made as good a Distinction of the *Baptists*, and accused only the Criminals, (if any be) and who they are, for we would as gladly find them out as Mr. *James*.

But why must this be called *a Piece of Railery?* You are very unkind and provoking in this, and many other things, wherein you have ridiculed me; all which I bless

God I can bear: And were it not that the pure Primitive Use of the Ordinances of Christ, and the People that profess the same, were abused by you, and exposed to Shame and Reproach in print, and published to the great dishonour of God, and the Truth we profess, I should not have given my self the trouble that I have undertaken; but I think my self obliged, and in Duty bound, to contend earnestly for that Faith that was once delivered to the Saints.

But Mr. *James* in the 28*th* Page saith, "Who would "think, or suspect, I wrote this Piece to reproach the *A*-"*nabaptists?* No, it was far from my Heart and Thoughts.

Truly if this be so, I am sorry at my Heart, Mr. *James* should be misunderstood; but if he be Innocent, great was his Ignorance, to put his Matter in such Terms as did reproach them: For is it not a Reproach upon the *Baptists*, when you tell the World they are the People to be mentioned; and then charge them with acting so inconsiderately, and doing so much Wrong; and that they sate in with him, and told him the way to have Peace and Comfort, was to be dipped? which I presume you can never prove, but by an evil Suggestion of your own, which is not fair.

And then you farther say; "That if a Man, or Woman "come under Trouble of Mind, and they spy it out; or "if any one newly be joined to their Fellow-Dissenters, "of other Opinions, immediately they set upon them, "thinking now is their time to proselyte them to a Party.

Sir, Pray be so kind, that if you know any such that are so industrious, and that by any irregular Means, do set upon your New Converts, or such as are newly joined unto you, and think to proselyte them to a Party, let us know who they are, for we are really ignorant of the Matter.

But you farther say; "And they urge Dipping, and lay "such a stress upon that, they make it a Salve for every "Spiritual Sore, and make all Religion in going into the "Water: And thus they take Advantage of the bodily "Weakness and Infirmity, and Confusion of their Minds, "to win Persons, or rather draw them to a Party. And "you tell us, this they are guilty of to your knowledg.

Now if this be so, Sir, why will you not discover them, and clear your self? But if you will not, or cannot, you

ought

ought to forbear reproaching of us without Cause. Now if all this be not a Reproach upon the *Baptists*, I must confess my self to be as ignorant as Mr. *James* represents me.

But till he proves all these things to be true that he has charged upon them, it is, and must be accounted, an abominable Slander; and the Shame and Reproaches must return upon himself. And as you have it in *Psal.* 7. 14, 15, 16. *Behold, he travaileth with Iniquity, and hath conceived Mischief, and brought forth Falshood. He hath made a Pit, and digged it, and is fallen into the Ditch he made. His Mischief shall return upon his own Head, and his violent Dealing shall come down upon his own Pate.* And this is the Fruit and Effect of Back-biting, Slandering, and Evil-surmisings.

But what, must no one speak with those that are troubled in Mind, save only Mr. *James*, but that they must do him wrong? Nay, if any did *R. M.* any wrong, in discoursing of Baptism, 'tis probable he was the Man; for *R. M.* shewed his dislike to what he had said about Sprinkling of Infants, esteeming it as a silly thing, which Mr. *James* put so much value upon, as if a poor innocent Infant could not be saved without it, tho Christ himself saith, *of such is the Kingdom of Heaven.* And when we do, by the Importunity of any, discourse of the Primitive Institution, which was Dipping of Believers, and such as were in trouble of Mind too; as did the Apostle *Peter*, in *Acts* 2. 36, 37, 38. when he had laid open their Sin in crucifying the Lord of Glory, that was both *Lord and Christ*; *which when they heard, they were pricked in the Heart, and said unto* Peter, *and the rest of the Apostles, Men and Brethren, what shall we do? And* Peter *said unto them, Repent and be baptized, every one of you.* Now these were prickt to the Heart, and in trouble of Mind; and in this Consideration cry, *What shall we do?* And whilst they had this Terror in their Souls, the Apostle to give them ease, directs them *to repent and be baptized, for the Remission of their Sins.* And another Instance you have in the Case of the Jaylor, who in a mighty Agony came in trembling, *Acts* 16. 29, 30, 31, 32, 33.

But it seems we must not discourse these things, lest we be ridiculed by Mr. *James*. But is not this very hard, that if a Person that is in trouble of Mind, should ask any

Questions

Questions in religious Matters, and with fear and trembling should say, What shall we do? must we, like Mr. *James*, answer only with Contempt? God forbid. No, we ought, with all sobriety, to instruct them in the Way of God more perfectly, as *Aquila* and *Priscilla* did *Apollo*. And this I take to be a Duty, and to give *a Reason of the Hope that is in us, with meekness and fear*, 1 Pet. 3. 15. And yet not for any Man to think of himself more highly than he ought; but to think soberly, according as God hath dealt to every Man the Measure of Faith: And not to despise the Day of small things, nor presume to be wise above what is written.

But Mr. *James*, *Pag.* 41. recites my words in my Book, where I do say, 'Tis very hard and unkind to bespatter us all, with the miscarriage of a Person, or Persons, if any be. And Mr. *James*'s answer is; "How little need there "is of this Reflection, may appear by what I have writ- "ten in my *Vindication*.

And to vindicate himself, he says, He has proof in abundance, but will not let you know who they are, nor name Persons. Now if this be Vindication, let the Judicious judg.

He further ridicules me for my Ignorance, and asketh this Question; "But why that Parenthesis, (if any such "be?)

Why, Sir, my Answer to that is this; I find it was a very necessary Question; for if any such be, you that accuse, ought to discover them; which if you do, you shall see how well we acquit our selves; and if we cannot, we must then confess there was much in what you have said: But I despair of your Discovery, and am sorry you have brought your self into so great a *Dilemma*, by a peevish and froward Humour.

Yet you further say; "Verily, I had not written so, if "I had not known it, or could not have proved it.

Now if you do know it, and can prove it, why is it not done? that would clear the whole Matter, and acquit you very honourably, and we might be made easy: For if you lay your Charge upon such as you know, and can prove to be guilty; if you would do it, we might acquit the Innocent, and deal with the Offenders, as the Merit of the Cause should require.

Dear

Dear Sir, let this be done, and it may go a great way towards the ending of the Controversy: But to stand by your Charge, and not to prove it, will not do.

But you are pleased to recite my words, which are, "We desire you to assign the Guilty, that we may clear "our selves of that foul Scandal, or else we presume all "is a Fiction of your own Brain.

Now I think this is not ill proposed; But Mr. *James*'s Answer is; "For assigning the Guilty, I have already an- "swered at large, and done enough towards that (I "doubt not) to clear my self that it was no Fiction of "mine, much less a malicious Design.

And is this the assigning the Guilty, by saying you have done it at large? *&c.*

Certainly your saying so is no good Proof; and if you can say no more, we cannot expect any good Proof will ever be made of what you accuse us of; but it must remain upon you, as a Fiction of your own Brain, till it be made appear otherwise.

But Mr. *James* saith; "Is not this very unchristian in "Mr. *Wells* to surmise thus, and suggest such foul things "as these ever and anon?

Why really, Sir, I am not willing to surmise or suggest by any evil Imagination: But you, if you will not prove the Matter you charged upon the *Baptists*, what can we say more or less, than that you cannot? There is no need of any foul Suggestions, for you have said enough in words at length: Recal, or dismiss them fairly, and it ends the Matter.

I am sorry Mr. *James* should think that I suggest these Slanders, and take the liberty to write *any thing* in this Matter, as he saith I do in *Pag.* 29.

No, Mr. *James*, I will take no liberty to misconstrue your Words, to alter your Sense; for I see no mighty Mystery in them: But as you have in words at length laid the Charge, so you may discharge them if you can.

And you farther say; "No Man I think will understand "me, that I said they told him, *in totidem Verbis*, but *in* "*Sensu*, that they perswaded him to this as a Way to "have Peace and Comfort.

Now, I pray Sir, let us try this, and see *Pag.* 42. of your *Spira*; your words are, (*viz.*) "There were a sort "of

" of People about him, who finding this poor Man in " Trouble, thought to make a Proselyte of him; and " presently sate in and told him, his way to have Peace " and Comfort was to be dipped.

Do you not say this, *in totidem Verbis?* that is, in plain Terms, that they, finding him in Trouble, took that Advantage, to make a Proselyte of him? And then do you not in plain Terms say, " And they presently " sat in and told him, his Way to have Peace and Com- " fort, was to be dipt. Why do you seek to evade this, and make as if your words were misconstrued? I pray assign them that did all this, and then you fix the Matter right; and we shall take it kindly, that so we might *warn them that are unruly*, 1 Thess. 5.14. Or *if a Man be overtaken in a Fault, that such might be restored in the Spirit of Meekness*, Gal.6.1. that is, by being made sensible of his Error. And it is the great Business of Religion to rectify Disorders; and it is the Duty of Brethren to take care one of another: And we think it our Duty to find out such Offenders, as Mr. *James* doth affirm we have among us, that we *might purge out the old Leaven*, 1 Cor. 5. 5, 6, 7.

But if he charge and accuse us in general, and yet mean but some in particular, and will not assign who they are, this must be but a scandalous Report, as some evil People did of old, *Jer.* 20. 10. *For I have heard the Defaming of many, fear on every side; Report, say they, and we will report it: All my Familiars watched for my halting, saying, Peradventure he will be enticed; and we shall prevail against him, and we shall take our Revenge on him.*

But to the Matter aforesaid, you say; " Now this I did " hear; though not spoken to him, yet by a Kinsman of " his, (it seems you were told it.)

How, Mr. *James!* Then it seems *you* print by Hearsay; but this you charge upon me as very criminal. It were much better, not to condemn that in another, which you allow in your self.

But you say farther; " I heard so much from his own " Mouth, that satisfied me that it was even so; and I " have proved it (*à posteriori*) in the former *Vindication*; " and there were some that did act thus.

Sir, Let it appear that it was even so, and that there were some that did act thus; in order to which I confess you do assign *H.L.* (*i.e.*) I presume *Henry Longley*. I

I pray hear what he saith, as thus:

" I *Henry Longley* of *Ashford* do testify and declare, That
" I did never urge to *Robert Millain* of *Westwell*, who
" was in a disturbed Condition, to be dipped, as his
" Spiritual Comfort and Profit; though I do own dip-
" ping Believers to be the right and true Baptism, in
" opposition to Infants Sprinkling. And though I do
" confess I was once occasionally in his Company, when
" I called to see his Sister, a poor Woman that lived with
" him; and the said *R. M.* knowing what I was, told me
" Mr. *James* had been there, and argued with him, that
" his Infant's Baptism was sufficient, and desired my Opi-
" nion about the same, seeming unsatisfied about that
" Point, as also with what Mr. *James* had told him. To
" which desire I returned him my Thoughts according to
" the Scripture, but not urging him to it, knowing him
" not to be in a suitable Condition then for such a Work;
" and had he offered himself for the Ordinance, I should
" not in that State have admitted him to it: Tho I still say,
" I had as much and more reason to plead with a Person
" that came to me to be informed concerning the Gospel-
" Ordinance of dipping Believers, which is so plain in
" the Scriptures of Truth, than Mr. *James* has to plead
" with Persons for Infants Sprinkling in opposition to
" Believers Baptism; for he cannot bring one plain
" Scripture-Precept or Example for it. But I say again, I
" never urged the said *R. M.* to be baptized or dipped,
" especially at that unseasonable time when he was almost
" in despair, and especially without Repentance and a
" change of Life, and Faith in Christ's Death, and Suf-
" ferings, and Resurrection, which fits the Soul for Bap-
" tism, and cannot be fit without it. Witness my Hand,

Hen. Longley.

Thus you have the Testimony of one of the Persons you assign, which doth you little Service but refute your Error.

And I must needs say you did acquit him and two more, which you call the *three Teachers*, when I was with you at *Ashford*; and therefore I wonder for what End or Purpose you put them into your Book, for I see no Service it can do you where you do recite them.

But

But in the next place Mr. *James* recites my words *Pag.* 30. *viz.* "But that Dipping should be a new Doctrine in your esteem, seems strange to us, or any that pretends to be a Minister of the Gospel (especially a Scholar) should so affirm.

To which Mr. *James*'s Answer is, "The dipping those already baptized, (or if you will, such as were baptized in Infancy) is indeed a new Doctrine.

Sir, I do affirm, the Infants you sprinkle are not baptized, neither are they fit Subjects for Baptism; and it may be said unto you one day, *Who hath required these things at your hands?*

And Mr. *James* farther saith, "Which of the Antients did ever do this? Who ever pleaded for it till of Yesterday? of very late Years: Let this be shewed by any of the Baptists; though Dipping be Baptizing, yet dipping those already baptized, though but in Infancy, (or by pouring on of Water) is a new Doctrine. Where was this practised in Primitive Times? In what Volume do ye read it? Indeed one or two (and I never saw more quoted) were against Baptizing in Infancy.

Sir, This is mighty strange you should thus put the Question, Which of the Antients did ever plead it till Yesterday? *&c.* Though Dipping be Baptizing, you allow: But I pray which of the Antients ever said that Sprinkling was Baptizing. But I find you are not so mightily read in the Antients that you need to boast of it; for if you had, you would have found more than one or two, for I praise God I have read many; and had I had the Education, and time to study and read, as I presume Mr. *James* and many other Scholars have had, without interruption of worldly Incumberances, I should have thought my self to have been disparaged by any that should have said I could not have found in many Volumes of the Antients, wherein is shewed their Opinion against Baptizing of Infants.

And because I am not willing to swell this little Piece with the many I could recite, I shall refer you to industrious Mr. *Danvers*, who in his Treatise of *Baptism*, printed 1674, the 2*d* Edition, gives you an Account from the first Century, and so on for sixteen hundred Years past,

wherein

wherein he gives an Historical Account of Baptism, as we find it was upon the Profession of Faith, owned to be practised by the Testimony of Antiquity, both in the first as well as in the following Centuries, *Pag.* 45 to the 87*th* of his Book.

But I pass over some of your insignificant Matter, and come to the latter end of your 31*st* Page, where you recite my words:

" And that the World may be sure to know who you " mean, you repeat (say you) *Anabaptists*, as you falsly " put upon them.

And the word *repeat* you carp at, and I confess you may; yet the oversight is not mighty great, for they were the Persons intended; which afterwards you repeat in several places, and give us the Appellation of *Anabaptists*, which I still deny that we are so; for there is but *one Lord, one Faith, one Baptism*; and we allow of but one Baptism of Christ, and all other is of no Force or Value.

But you say, " Surely *Anabaptist* and *Baptist* are not one " and the same Name.

And you say true; and therefore you abuse us when you call us *Anabaptist*; for *Ana* is *again*, but we baptize but once; and that we truly and orderly, according to Christ's Commission and the Apostles Practice And all other Baptism is invalid and of no Force; nor is your Sprinkling, or Rantizing, Baptism.

But you assign a seeming Necessity why you must call *Anabaptist*:

For, say you, " If we call you not *Anabaptist*, we do " in a sort disown our own Baptism and Principles about " that Point.

This is but a sorry shift, to nickname us to support your Principles; such Props will stand you but in little stead: Yet you seem to tell us, as if you could use us more coarsly, but that you are not for long and hard Names: And yet you put them in, and say,

" *Sesquipedalia Verba*; or else I had used that Name of " *Catapœdobaptist*.

Sesqui-

Sesq...pedalia verba are words of a Cubit, or a foot and half long; and yet you say you are not for long and hard Words. And as to *Catapædobaptist*, it is a long hard word too, the signification of which is against Infant-Baptism; and in this you do not wrong us, and therefore if you tell us this in down-right English, we will not take it ill: For we are against Infant-Baptism, because there is no Precept or Example in the Scriptures for it; so that if you should baptize them, it would be of no Force or Value. And when you do but sprinkle, it is not baptizing, as is very apparent in my Friend's Treatise prefixt to this Book, to which I do refer you if you please to peruse it.

FINIS.

A Cautionary Epistle

To all those beloved Souls over whom the Lord hath constituted me an Overseer.

Edmund Charles

Dearly Beloved,

I Am bound in Duty to watch for your Souls Security; and do therefore think it necessary to write unto you at this time, to admonish and strengthen you, that you may hold fast the Profession of your Faith without wavering, and not be beguiled by fair Pretences and gilded Glosses, to turn away from the Truth of the Gospel.

Dear Souls, I am not wholly ignorant (through Grace) of Satan's Devices to undermine and deceive you, watching to rob your Souls, either of that Salvation held forth in the Gospel, or of the Truth and Comfort of that Gospel that brings you Salvation. It is not easy to reckon up the multifarious Methods of that Politick Adversary, whereby he seeks to destroy our Souls, or eclipse our Comforts, and hinder our Spiritual Communion with God. I intend no large Discourse of this Subject at present; but I may say, in the Words of the Holy Apostle, *I fear lest by* [*any*] *means, as the Serpent beguiled* Eve *through his Subtilty, so your Minds should be corrupted from the* [*Simplicity*] *that is in Christ.*

Now amongst many other ways whereby you are in danger to be beguiled, there is nothing more prevalent, or more likely to seduce you at present, than Mr. *Calvin*'s Doctrine of *Election* and *Reprobation*, which some among you have heartily espoused, with the pernicious Consequences thereof; who notwithstanding do endeavour, with all wily subtilty to keep you ignorant of what they hold, lest the dreadful and amazing Consequences of it should affright your Souls from a cordial imbracing the Doctrine it self. And inasmuch as you have intimacy with them, and cordially love them for the Truth that is in them, so you are in the greater danger by them; for a professed Enemy, or one that you only suspect for a Deceiver, cannot have that influence upon you, as a professed Friend that you entirely love. Not that I blame you for loving of them; only beware, considering your danger, that you be not beguiled by them. For my part I love them, and pity them, and should rejoice to be a poor Instrument in the Lord's Hand to undeceive them. In the mean time I cannot chuse but blame them,

1*st*. For their Negligence, in not seeking for a timely Resolution of their Doubts, when this Doctrine began first to invade, either in Reading or Conference. Doubtless if they had been diligent in this Case, before their Minds had been corrupted, they might have been rightly informed, and more fully confirmed in their professed Faith. No question but there is help to be had in such Cases, either from the fixed or travelling Ministry, or from their Convention in some General Assembly. But I observe one thing which is of dangerous Conse-

quence,

quence, that is, when People think themselves so wise that they need no Counsel, or so able to resolve Doubts, that they neither care for, or crave the Assistance of the Brotherhood or Ministry; contemning others in respect of themselves, as if the Members of the same Body need no help one from another, or that the Ministry was an useless Pageantry, or insignificant Cipher.

2*ly*. I must needs blame them for their imprudent and unjust Separation. 1. Imprudent; because it grieves the Brotherhood, disquiets the Church, rejoiceth the Enemy, stumbles the Weak, and may hinder enquiring Souls. 2. Unjust; for who gave them Cause? They were not Excommunicated for their Opinion, they might have kept their Places and Membership amongst us, if they had kept their Faith to themselves before God, and had not disquieted the Church with it; nay, when it might have been orderly for their Conveniency, they (to their own Comfort and our Satisfaction) might have been dismissed from us, and joined to some orderly Congregation of the same Faith with them, if they could not have been convinced of their Error, or had no comfort to continue in our Communion. But nothing less than preaching amongst us, to disquiet the Members, or leven them with their Doctrine, would satisfy them and serve their turn, but they refuse all other friendly Proposals, and make a Schism. How they will acquit themselves I know not; either we are no true Church of Christ without their Opinion, or they are Schismaticks: Take to which they please; if to the last, they have great reason to humble themselves before the Lord, and to take Shame for such

foul Disorder: but if they say we are no true Church, we are willing to defend our selves.

3ly. I think them blame-worthy for hiding their Opinion. If there be no difference in our Faith, but that they and we hold the same Thing, (as they sometimes pretend to weak Members, when they have a mind to beguile them) then why do they separate from us, and set up Meetings by themselves? Doubtless something is the matter, or else they would never be so bold to make a Separation from us; I think it must be something, and a great matter too that will warrant a Separation from a true Church.

But to proceed; There is a Difference in Point of Faith, though they are not willing you should know the Bottom of it till they have won you to their Party; for when I have personally blamed them for seeking to hide their Principles, have they not told me to my Face, in words to this effect, That there are some things that it is not proper or profitable to divulge to weak Christians? And did not *D. T.* own it in a Brother's House at *Bourne*, that he spake to that effect? And did not *T. J.* justify the Saying, by referring to the Practice of Christ and his Apostles, who spake the Word to the People as they were able to hear it? And what is this but to tell us, that they intend to reserve a full discovery of these things till a fitter Opportunity, when the People are better prepared to hear them, and entertain them? And yet they are not such profound Mysteries neither, but they may conveniently enough be divulged to some young Converts.

My

My dear Friends, beware, for they lie in wait o deceive and beguile you. They will tell you Christ died for all, they will seem to own it as vell as you; and you, in the plainness of your Hearts, think verily that they mean as you mean, *bona fide*, plainly and in good Faith; you perceive iot the Deceit that is laid up within them, for hey mean, Christ died to purchase Salvation on- y for the Elect. The Benefit that most Men iave by the Death of Christ, is only the good Things of this Life, (and alas poor Hearts! some f them have little enough of that) with the Ad- ition of a short Reprieve from hellish Torments; or thither they must go, by the Almighty and inchangeable Decree of God, made before they vere so much as born, or had a Being, yea, be- ore the Foundation of the World; only because f Christ's Death sudden Wrath doth not fall pon them. Some of these are *T. J.* his own Vords in his Papers to me. To which we may dd another of his Sayings, To make Redemp- ion larger than Election, is (saith he) an over- aying the Foundation. So that it is evident, hat their Doctrine excludes all from the Benefit f Redemption, who are not first in the Election. Such to this purpose is plainly delivered in a Book vhich one of them lent me, and vhich some of them say hath con- inced them; which Book I refer o in the Margin; from whence I erceive they have not only their Notions, but also orrow many of their very Words and Expressi- ns.

A Pract. Disc. of God's Sovereignty, p. 116.

They will also tell you, That God loves all Men: And you think they mean, that God would have all Men to be saved; but they are of another mind, for their Faith is, That God hath decreed the Destruction and Eternal Damnation of most Men, without any Remedy: and God's Love to all Men, extends no further than the Death of Christ for all Men, which is to bestow a few Temporal Blessings upon them: and perhaps too, if you sound them to the Bottom, all these good Things are but to do them a Mischief withal, even to aggravate their Condemnation. So that when all things are put together, it is but a very diminutive Degree of Love which God bears to all Men by their Account.

Again they will tell you slifly, That they hold no personal and absolute Reprobation, tho they hold personal and absolute Election. But then ask them what becomes of the Rest? Why, no reprobated? no, by no means, this is enough to fright People: But what then? Why, they are left; for these are *T. F.* his own words, [*Where there are any chosen, some must needs be refused or left*]. But now what become of these Leaving and Refuse of the People? Why the Author of the aforenamed Book resolveth this Doubt, *Pag.* 3 and 4. He is there declaring what God decreed before he made the World; and amongst the rest this is one thing (as he saith) that was then decreed of God, namely, "That to make known "the Power of his Wrath, and his just Displea"sure against Sin, he would [leave] the [rest] "that State of Perdition they would bring them"selves into: That of these Vessels of Wrath

"[Sat-

" [Satan himself] should be the Head and Ru-
" ler.

So that the [Rest] that are left out of the Election, are Vessels of Wrath, to be left to the Devil himself, to be guided by him as their Head and Ruler, that so they may sin, and bring themselves into Perdition. And indeed I know not how it should be otherwise, but that Men must needs sin themselves to Hell, if they be left to the Devil to guide them. Here is Reprobation with the highest Aggravation. O horrible Doctrine! O miserable Doctors! How dishonourable to God, and pernicious to the Souls of Men are such Notions as these!

Now if this Author could read me such a Decree out of any Authentick Record, out of the Sayings of Christ, the Prophets, or Apostles, then I should be dumb with Silence, because the Lord did it, and should cease to move my Pen or Tongue against it: In the mean while I shall say in the Words of one of the Antients, *I believe it not, because I read it not.*

And thus they do not hold Reprobation, but they hold that some Men are left as Vessels of Wrath, to be ruled by the Devil himself, and to go with him to Hell.

But to proceed: I do well hope that these Men have a Godly Meaning (some of them at the least) in the whole of this Business, and doubtless think verily they are in the right on't; and it is their Zeal to that which they believe to be Truth, that makes them use such crafty Methods to win others to their Opinion, though I think a little plainer Dealing would look more like Godly Simplicity.

But we will cover them with all the Love that we can, and we will suppose they want some of that Christian Prudence which we all want; and if they could think of Ways more sutable to the Gospel, they would use them.

And as to their denying of Reprobation, we must consider them as Pupils, Minors, and Babes in their New Opinion, but newly initiated; and scarcely know themselves what they hold as yet: But doubtless they hold with others that deny General Redemption; for why? they do own such to be of their Faith, and the aforesaid Book to be the instrumental Cause of their Convincement. To be short, my Advice to you all is, to pity and pray for them; but withal, beware you be not beguiled by them.

But now that I may be further useful and instrumental to prevent your being beguiled with specious Pretences and crafty Devices, I shall caution you against that Book that hath had such a powerful Influence upon our Brethren, to captivate their Understandings, and draw them from their professed Faith; and may have the like Effect upon others if they take not heed. Now I shall shew you some Reasons of the Prevailing of that Book.

1st. It hath the Approbation and Commendation of some Learned Men, which no doubt wrote those Epistles in Commendation of it, only for that End, to make it more acceptable to the Readers. This is one Bait, and it may be had some Influence upon them.

2ly. One in a Letter to the Author, professeth, That he hath received great Satisfaction, Comfort,

and

and Content in the reading of it. And this may be another Lure, and doubtless for that End was placed in the Front of the Book.

3*ly*. The Objections against his Doctrine are thought, by these Learned Approvers, to be strenuously refuted: And unwary Readers are not able to discern the contrary.

4*ly*. It is managed in a Spirit of Meekness, and therefore it is more likely to obtain its End.

5*ly*. It is managed with abundance of Subtilty, imitating the wily Coy-man, endeavouring to keep himself out of sight in that Part that may affright his Game, till he have them sure in his Net. As touching the Point of Reprobation, he doth very sparingly express it, tho he constantly implies it. But instead of the words *Reprobate* and *Reprobation*, he frequently useth such words as these, namely, the [*Rest*] they that were [*Left*], God did [*Leave*], were [*not Elected*] and [*Non-Election*], or some such-like Phrase of Speech. And altho the Negative Part of his Doctrine excludes most Men from the Favour of God, he doth as it were leave that, or very lightly touch upon it, but rather endeavours to secure the Affirmative Part, which gives some Men such a firm Interest in Salvation, that their own Unworthiness or Averseness cannot make void or hinder that gracious Intendment, as he saith, *Pag*. 48.

And thus he leads poor Souls into a Labyrinth of Error, or e're they are aware, with this delightful Charm, and pleasing Apprehension, that the Reader himself is one of these Elect Persons that must invincibly be saved. When alas, poor Heart! he

is

is never the near; for if he be one that hath a firm Faith in Christ, and endure to the End, he shall be saved, if he never read that Book, nor receive that Opinion. But if upon reading that Book, he should trust to that unfrustrable Salvation, and neglect his Christian Diligence, he may miss of his Expectation for all that Opinion.

6ly. That he may prevail against the Doctrine of General Redemption, and consequently endear Men to the contrary Opinion, he endeavours to cast some *Odium* upon the Professors of it, and to fasten some Absurdities upon the Doctrine it self. As touching the Professors of it, they are (as he saith) the generality of Men in Nature. What he means by [*Men in Nature*] I do not well understand, except it be unconverted, profane, and carnal Men. But he adds, (though you must think he hath a very ill Opinion of this Judgment, yet the Professors of it are worse to like, for the most part of them, than the Judgment it self); And thus he saith, of the [*most*] the Judgment is better than their Practice. So that this is his Character upon [*most*] of the Professors of General Redemption, their Opinion is bad, and their Practice worse.

Now suppose this were true concerning their Practice, or that the Patrons and Abetters of this Opinion, were most of them such as he would seem to describe them; doth this Consequence therefore follow, That the Opinion it self is false? Doubtless he brings this in to insinuate such a thing, tho not directly to prove it. But this might all be retorted back upon himself; for if that Opinion which hath the generality of Men in Nature

ture for Patrons and Abetters of it be falſe, then we ſhall ſoon come to queſtion the Being of God, for moſt natural Men do ſtifly maintain this Glorious Truth, and with full Conſent do own that there is a God.

And as for the Practice of thoſe of his own Judgment reſpecting Election, I have not yet ſeen them exceed the contrary-minded, tho I confeſs there are many bad People that own the General Point; ſo, no doubt there are alſo of the Particular Perſwaſion. And alſo there are ſincere and godly People of both Sorts, and pity it is that inſolent and ill Men ſhould alienate their Affections one from another, and ſow ſo much Diſcord amongſt theſe faithful Brethren.

And now what hath he gained by this crafty Inſinuation, and reflective Odium? And I very well approve of his reflecting Reproof upon thoſe ſordid and diſingenuous Spirits, who hold for a general Ranſom, and yet ſtudy nothing leſs than to anſwer its Ends, as he ſaith *Pag.* 136.

But he endeavours to lay the Doctrine it ſelf under abundance of blame, as tho it were a Carnal Doctrine, and ſet up Man more than is meet; and reflected Diſhonour upon Chriſt, and I know not what, abundance to this Purpoſe: From which unjuſt Accuſations this bleſſed and comfortable Doctrine hath been fully and ſufficiently vindicated in Times paſt, by one hand or other, and may be again in due Time and Place.

But by ſuch ways as theſe, he inſinuates his Opinion into the Hearts of his unwary Readers, pretending that his Doctrine aſcribes the whole of our Salvation unto God, and exalts his Free

Grace;

Grace; which ours he reckons doth greatly blemish: and tender Christians who dread to reflect the least Dishonour upon God, are very subject to be taken with this *Lure*. But upon a deliberate examination it will be found, that it is his Doctrine that reflects Dishonour upon God, and not ours.

I am perswaded that this Lure *hath taken our Brethren.*

The *7th* and last Reason which I shall urge for the prevailing of his Book, is, There is much Truth mixed with his Errors, many Scriptures alledged, and much godly and comfortable Discourse (well worth every good Man's reading) is aptly handled, in a very proper and commendable Stile, which of it self has an Attractive Virtue; sometimes whole Paragraphs together are generally wholsome Truths. So that it requires a competent Understanding to distinguish between one and the other, so as to separate the Gold of Truth from the Dross of Error.

And now I would caution you against something which the contrary-minded have frequently charged upon the Profession, and Professors of General Redemption; that as the Profession it self is innocent and clear from their Charge in this Matter, so I would that you may be clear also; which if you be, there is no great danger of your being inticed or beguiled by them; yea, I doubt not but you are clear in a great measure in this respect. But indeed I fear that those that are turned aside, have been a little tinctured themselves with that which they would charge upon others, or else I cannot think how the contrary Perswasion should so easily prevail against them.

That

That which they charge upon us, is, Leaning to our own Works for Righteousness, Justification, and Acceptance with God; and Leaning to our own Strength and Ability to perform them. Both which are very false, and you can bear me witness, that against these two dangerous Doctrines of Self-Righteousness, and Self-Confidence, I have laboured with all my Might, according to my poor Ability, to refel and refute them.

And now I say again, beware and take heed,

First, Of Self-Righteousness, know that it is Christ that must present you faultless in the Presence of God, and not your own Works; no, not your best Works, and most holy Duties, they may be acceptable to God by Jesus Christ, but it is God that makes you accepted in his beloved Son. Therefore lean not to your Works, your Duties; perform them, and then deny them; take them all up in Point of Performance, but lay them all down in Point of Acceptance: consider when you have done all, you are but unprofitable Servants, and have done but that which was your Duty to do; look for no thanks for them as any due desert, for you have merited nothing at the Hands of God.

Secondly, Beware of Self-Confidence; consider that you have no Ability of your selves, or from your selves, to do any acceptable Duty to God, no not to think, nor to will, nor to do: *Not that we are sufficient of our selves, to think any thing as of our selves, but our sufficiency is of God*, 2 Cor. 3. 5. *For it is God that worketh in you*,

you, to will and to do of his good Pleasure, Philip. 2. 13.

Therefore let us strive to act every Duty with all our Spiritual Might that we have received; but when all is done, look upon our selves as unprofitable Servants, and learn to live upon the Lord Christ as our Righteousness and Rest, Peace and Propitiation, Assistance and Acceptance, our All, above All, and in All.

Yet withal consider, that the gracious Operations of God's good Spirit in our Hearts, whereby he stirs us up to Consideration, and the Duties of Religion; this free and unsought-for Grace, doth only make Men able to do good, but not unable to do Evil.

And further consider, that this Grace of God that enables Men to look up unto him, and to seek for Blessings where they may be had, is a full and free Fountain of Grace for all Men. I will not say, all Men have it in like Measure, nor at the same Time of their Lives, nor yet one Man at the same Opportunity that another Man may have it communicated to him, nor after the same manner, nor by the same means; for God worketh diversly with the Children of Men. But all Men, one time or other in their Life-time, by one means or other, in one measure or other, have a real Offer of Grace; yea, in such a measure, and in that degree to save them, if well husbanded and improved by them: for God does not dissemble with Men, and make seeming, but real Offers of Grace; though not so exceeding forcibly, but that Men may, and often

ten do reſiſt it, to their own juſt Condemnation, and eternal Deſtruction; for if the Offer of Grace was not real, Men could not be left without Excuſe.

But ſtill the Scorner delights in his Scorning, and Fools hate Knowledg. And of this Sort there are that call this Grace I ſpeak of, *Free-Will Grace*; let them if they pleaſe.

1. It is Grace, from God's Free-Will, and Good-Will to the Children of Men.

And, 2. it works a Free-Will in the Creature to act that which is well-pleaſing to God by Jeſus Chriſt.

And ſo I care not, let the Scorner call it *Free-Will Grace* as long as he pleaſes, and ſo will I: for God ſhall thereby be honoured, the Scorner reproved, Saints comforted, and unreclaimable Sinners left without Excuſe.

And now, dear Friends, to conclude, I could heartily wiſh, for the benefit of Chriſt's Church, the Engliſh Nation, and your Souls, that the Book I ſpake of was anſwered; for I perceive it is hugg'd as a wonderful choice Piece, and is thought by ſome to be unanſwerable. Now I confeſs that I am a Man of mean Parts, and not ſo able to diſcuſs and reſolve difficult Points as many of my Brethren are: But I am able to ſee, (by the Grace of God) that the Author of that Book, whoever he was, hath greatly erred, and gone aſide from the Truth, in the main Scope and Deſign of his Book. And as you are bound, by Goſpel-Rules, to be ready to every good Work,

ſo

so I would perswade you to promote and encourage this needful Work, that a distinct Answer may be given in print to the aforesaid Book; that so Truth may be advanced, Error unmasked, humble penitent Sinners encouraged, the Faith of weak Christians strengthened, some that are beguiled again recovered, the Churches established, and God's boundless Love in Christ Jesus to the Sons of Men be magnified, which is the End of this Epistle.

Aug. 1st Day, 1694.

From your faithful Friend, affectionate Brother, and bounden Servant for Jesus sake,

JOSEPH HOOKE.

FINIS.

9 3052